

## NEW YORK.

George H. Kennedy to be postmaster at Cortland, in the county of Cortland and State of New York, in place of Andrew S. Brown. Incumbent's commission expired January 7, 1907.

Freeman H. Merritt to be postmaster at White Plains, in the county of Westchester and State of New York, in place of James H. Moran. Incumbent's commission expired December 9, 1906.

James A. Snell to be postmaster at Fonda, in the county of Montgomery and State of New York, in place of George L. Davis. Incumbent's commission expired June 10, 1906.

## OHIO.

Wirt Kessler to be postmaster at West Milton, in the county of Miami and State of Ohio, in place of Wirt Kessler. Incumbent's commission expires January 26, 1907.

## OKLAHOMA.

Jeannette L. Baker to be postmaster at Ponca, in the county of Kay and Territory of Oklahoma, in place of Burton S. Barnes, deceased.

## OREGON.

Edward D. Starr to be postmaster at Brownsville, in the county of Linn and State of Oregon. Office became Presidential January 1, 1907.

## PENNSYLVANIA.

William I. Kopp to be postmaster at Allegheny, in the county of Allegheny and State of Pennsylvania, in place of John Francies, resigned.

## CONFIRMATIONS.

*Executive nominations confirmed by the Senate January 9, 1907.*

## ASSISTANT ATTORNEY-GENERAL.

Edward T. Sanford, of Tennessee, to be Assistant Attorney-General.

## DISTRICT JUDGE.

Thomas Ives Chatfield, of New York, to be United States district judge for the eastern district of New York, commencing January 1, 1907.

## SURVEYORS OF CUSTOMS.

Thomas C. Elliott, of Illinois, to be surveyor of customs for the port of Cairo, in the State of Illinois.

Marcellus O. Markham, of Georgia, to be surveyor of customs for the port of Atlanta, in the State of Georgia.

## COLLECTORS OF CUSTOMS.

A. Lincoln Dryden, of Maryland, to be collector of customs for the eastern district, in the State of Maryland.

Morton Tower, of Oregon, to be collector of customs for the southern district, in the State of Oregon.

Herbert D. Philbrick, of Maine, to be collector of customs for the district of York, in the State of Maine.

William H. Daniels, of New York, to be collector of customs for the district of Oswegatchie, in the State of New York.

## PROMOTIONS IN THE NAVY.

Professor of Mathematics Lucien F. Prud'homme, United States Navy, retired, with the rank of commander, to be a professor of mathematics on the retired list of officers of the Navy, with the rank of captain, from the 29th day of June, 1906, in accordance with a provision contained in the naval appropriation act approved on that date.

Gunner Cornelius Cronin, United States Navy, retired, to be a chief gunner on the retired list of the Navy, to rank with but after ensign, from the 29th day of June, 1906, in accordance with the provisions of the naval appropriation act approved on that date.

Commander Rogers H. Galt to be a captain in the Navy from the 11th day of December, 1906.

Lieut. Luke McNamee to be a lieutenant-commander in the Navy from the 12th day of June, 1906.

Lieut. Charles J. Lang to be a lieutenant-commander in the Navy from the 25th day of December, 1906.

Lieut. Martin E. Trench to be a lieutenant-commander in the Navy from the 1st day of January, 1907.

Sailmaker Charles E. Tallman, United States Navy, retired, to be a chief sailmaker on the retired list of the Navy, to rank with, but after, ensign, from the 29th day of June, 1906.

## APPOINTMENTS IN THE NAVY.

To be assistant surgeons in the Navy from the 20th day of December, 1906, to fill vacancies existing in that grade on that date:

Renier J. Straeten, a citizen of South Dakota, and  
James T. Duhigg, a citizen of Iowa.

XLI—53

## POSTMASTERS.

## GEORGIA.

Clifford H. Dyar to be postmaster at Adairsville, in the county of Bartow and State of Georgia.

## ILLINOIS.

Thomas M. Crossman to be postmaster at Edwardsville, in the county of Madison and State of Illinois.

Abraham L. Coyle to be postmaster at Gridley, in the county of McLean and State of Illinois.

Clarence F. Buck to be postmaster at Monmouth, in the county of Warren and State of Illinois.

## IOWA.

John Meyer to be postmaster at Alton, in the county of Sioux and State of Iowa.

Simon J. Mak to be postmaster at Inwood, in the county of Lyon and State of Iowa.

Asahel B. Chrysler to be postmaster at Lake Park, in the county of Dickinson and State of Iowa.

## MARYLAND.

James C. Peddicord to be postmaster at Oakland, in the county of Garrett and State of Maryland.

## MINNESOTA.

William Gallagher to be postmaster at Carlton, in the county of Carlton and State of Minnesota.

William J. Cowling to be postmaster at Ely, in the county of St. Louis and State of Minnesota.

## NEW YORK.

Oscar E. Ward to be postmaster at Phoenix, in the county of Oswego and State of New York.

Lasuvius H. King to be postmaster at Port Byron, in the county of Cayuga and State of New York.

Lucius A. Waldo to be postmaster at Canisteo, in the county of Steuben and State of New York.

Millard D. McNeil to be postmaster at Oxford, in the county of Chenango and State of New York.

## PENNSYLVANIA.

William I. Kopp to be postmaster at Allegheny, in the county of Allegheny and State of Pennsylvania.

## HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES.

WEDNESDAY, January 9, 1907.

The House met at 12 o'clock m.

Prayer by the Chaplain, Rev. HENRY N. COUDEN, D. D.

The Journal of yesterday's proceedings was read and approved.

## CLERKS AND CARRIERS IN THE CHICAGO POST-OFFICE.

Mr. MANN. Mr. Speaker, I call up a matter of privilege.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Illinois presents a privileged matter. What motion does the gentleman make?

Mr. MANN. I call up for consideration the House resolution 651. It is a request for information from the head of a Department, and has not been reported by the committee in ten days.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Illinois moves to discharge the Committee on the Post-Office and Post-Roads from further consideration of a resolution which the Clerk will report.

The Clerk read as follows:

House resolution 651.

*Resolved*, That the Postmaster-General be, and he is hereby, directed to report to the House of Representatives at the earliest practicable moment the number of clerks and carriers in the Chicago post-office who resigned, the number who were dismissed, the number who were appointed, both regularly and temporarily, the number who declined appointment after being upon the eligible list, the number of substitute clerks and the total amount paid to substitute clerks, by months, all for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1906.

Mr. MANN. Mr. Speaker, the resolution is simply to acquire some information in an official manner for use in the consideration of the post-office appropriation bill.

Mr. PAYNE. When was it introduced?

Mr. MANN. On December 10.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the motion to discharge the committee from further consideration of the resolution.

The question was taken; and the resolution was agreed to.

On motion of Mr. MANN, a motion to reconsider the vote by which the resolution was agreed to was laid on the table.

## MESSAGE FROM THE SENATE.

A message from the Senate, by Mr. PARKINSON, its reading clerk, announced that the Senate had passed bill of the following title; in which the concurrence of the House of Representatives was requested:

S. 7211. An act to amend an act entitled "An act to amend

an act to construct a bridge across the Missouri River at a point between Kansas City and Sibley, in Jackson County, Mo.," approved March 19, 1904.

#### SENATE BILL REFERRED.

Under clause 2 of Rule XXIV, Senate bill of the following title was taken from the Speaker's table and referred to its appropriate committee, as indicated below:

S. 7211. An act to amend an act entitled "An act to amend an act to construct a bridge across the Missouri River at a point between Kansas City and Sibley, in Jackson County, Mo.," approved March 19, 1904—to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

#### ARMY APPROPRIATION BILL.

Mr. HULL. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House resolve itself into Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for the further consideration of the bill making appropriations for the support of the Army.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Iowa moves that the House resolve itself into Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for the further consideration of the Army appropriation bill.

The question was taken; and the motion was agreed to.

The House accordingly resolved itself into Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union, Mr. CURRIER in the chair.

The CHAIRMAN. The House is in Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for the further consideration of the bill H. R. 23551, the Army appropriation bill.

Mr. HULL. Mr. Chairman, I would like to ask how much time remains for general debate?

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Iowa has one hour and thirty-five minutes remaining, and the gentleman from Virginia thirty-three minutes.

Mr. HULL. Mr. Chairman, I would state I know of no one who desires to discuss the question; and I ask the gentleman from Virginia to consume his time.

Mr. HAY. I yield twenty minutes to the gentleman from Louisiana [Mr. MEYER].

Mr. HULL. Before the gentleman commences, I would ask if the gentleman will conclude in twenty minutes?

Mr. MEYER. Probably.

Mr. HULL. If not, I will yield whatever time the gentleman requires.

Mr. MEYER. Mr. Chairman, the 8th day of January is a legal holiday in the State of Louisiana. Our people are proud of the heritage of the great battle fought on our soil, sanctified by the heroism of our sons and those of Tennessee, Kentucky, and other American patriots. The admirable address made by the gentleman from Tennessee [Mr. GAINES], appropriate to the day and to the current discussion, inspires me to add a few remarks upon that great event, and especially to bring before the House a reminder of a measure that has been favorably reported by the Committee on the Library for the completion of a monument on the battlefield of Chalmette, the scene of the battle of New Orleans, a shaft designed to commemorate that great event. This report states the purpose of the bill I had the honor to introduce, to accept the cession to the United States of the Chalmette monument and grounds, and to appropriate the sum of \$25,000 with which to complete the monument located thereon, under the direction of the Secretary of War, who shall appoint a commission composed of three persons to recommend a suitable design for the completion of said monument, with such inscriptions and emblems as may properly commemorate the valor and sacrifices of the American Army in the battle of New Orleans. When said monument shall have been completed the care and keeping of same, and of the grounds surrounding it, subject to such other control as the Secretary of War may determine, shall remain with the United States Daughters of 1776 and 1812, a corporation of the city of New Orleans.

The Chalmette monument was begun by the Jackson Monument Association in 1855, and is located upon a parcel of land in the parish of St. Bernard, in the State of Louisiana, facing the Mississippi River and southeast of the city of New Orleans, measuring about 1 acre front, and comprises a part of the Chalmette battle ground.

The accepted design consisted of a plain shaft 142 feet high, 16 feet 8 inches square at the base, and 12 feet 6 inches at the top. The work was partially erected in accordance with the specifications annexed to the contract. The shaft as it stands to-day is 56 feet 10 inches high. It will thus be seen that the monument lacks 85 feet of being built to its originally planned height. In its present incomplete state the top is covered over with a plain board deck, with the result that it is insignificant in height, unsymmetrical in proportion, and belittles rather than fittingly memorializes a great event in our history. The monument is not only plainly visible from the Mississippi and in view of all passing vessels from New Orleans to the Gulf, but because of its proximity to the city and being built upon a part of the battlefield and near Chalmette Cemetery, the locality is visited by thousands of tourists and pleasure seekers. An additional advantage secured by passing the pro-

posed bill is that vesting the title of the monument grounds in the United States Government gives it more than an acre of ground within a few hundred feet of Chalmette Cemetery, making it feasible to connect the two properties, enlarge the cemetery, and combine both in a perpetual memorial of the battle of New Orleans.

The project commends itself apart from its intrinsic merit, because what has already been done is the result of private subscription, and commends those who first help themselves to assistance from the Government.

Mr. Chairman, it is my pleasing and appropriate duty, in behalf of the State of Louisiana, to press upon the attention of Congress the erection of this monument in honor of the signal victory achieved by the American arms under the leadership of the immortal Jackson upon the plains of Chalmette, near the city of New Orleans, on the 8th of January, 1815. Jackson won many victories in peace and in war, but, great as was his military genius and civic capacity, the student of history will find in his defense of Louisiana, beginning with his arrival on the 1st of December, 1814, to the final repulse and collapse of the British invasion, the highest proofs of a military capacity which will always give him rank among the great captains of the world. His very presence was an inspiration. Doubt, fear, discord, insubordination vanished before his presence and resistless energy. He was confronted by a superior force of veterans, schooled by the great Duke of Wellington in the peninsular campaigns, the heroes of Badajoz, Ciudad Rodrigo, Vitoria, and many bloody combats, and led by many commanders who knew not what it was to fear any obstacle or danger.

They had the best arms, the highest equipment, perfect discipline, an overwhelming naval force. Jackson had a smaller army, of comparatively raw troops, with many unskilled and inexperienced officers, soldiers badly armed, half disciplined, not accustomed to act together, and who received their principal instruction in arms in this very campaign. Among the defenders were released convicts and Lafitte's pirates, only the day before outlawed and proscribed, and other incongruous elements, but all welded together into one resistless mass by the fire of Jackson's patriotism. The city was greatly exposed. There were many points of attack, and it was difficult to anticipate at what point the enemy's blow would be struck. As it was, New Orleans was very nearly surprised. A large British force was landed very near the city before Jackson, with all his vigilance, knew of their coming. His preparations, however, were promptly made, and he attacked them that very night in their works. He swore in his mighty wrath that they should not sleep on the soil of Louisiana, and faithfully did he keep his word. He attacked them incessantly until the day of final assault by Pakenham, when the flower of Britain's chivalry went down before the deadly aim of the riflemen of Tennessee and the hunters of Kentucky. After that overwhelming, crushing repulse the city of New Orleans and the Province of Louisiana were safe.

To appreciate the grandeur of this victory we must remember that it came at the close of a war in which success and defeat had quickly followed the other. On the sea, indeed, our arms were generally victorious. British frigates for the first time almost in history were compelled to strike their colors. Still we had painful reverses, too, on the water. On the land our repeated attempts to invade and overrun Canada had all been repulsed. No impression had been made in that quarter. There had been successes and reverses, and among the latter one shameful capitulation by an American commander. We had, indeed, the glory of Scott and Macomb to console us, but Canada defied our arms and most energetic endeavors. The Indians had cooperated with the enemy and laid waste our exposed northwestern frontier. A British force had landed on the Patuxent River, in Maryland, not many miles from this city of Washington, had marched across the country to Bladensburg, routed the American Army, and then had marched unopposed to our seat of government, burning our Capitol, the President's Mansion, and other public buildings, while the President and his Cabinet had to flee before them.

Treason and disaffection were rearing their front at the Hartford convention, and the war, begun with so much spirit and enthusiasm, was pressing hardly upon our resources as a people. It was at this trying hour that the victory at New Orleans came to gladden the hearts of patriots and to wipe out the disgrace of Hull's surrender and the occupation of our capital by a hostile force. It may be said that a treaty of peace had already been signed before Jackson won his famous victory and that it was therefore unimportant. This would be a shallow view to take of the subject. Suppose Pakenham had defeated Jackson and overrun the Territory of Louisiana, would Great Britain have surrendered it? Our experience of her systematic bad faith in not carrying out our treaty of peace in 1783 and of her gross repudiation of the treaty of Amiens made with Napoleon, and of many breaches of treaty engagements by England and other



nations ought to admonish us that if Louisiana had ever been conquered by England its prompt restoration to the United States would have been very doubtful and possibly not effected without prolonged hostilities. But apart from this, I hold that the victory of New Orleans served to develop the national character and by its example to admonish all foreign governments of the exceeding and inherent strength of governments founded on free institutions.

The French revolution was eventually put down, it is true, but it has been a lesson to tyrants ever since. The victory at New Orleans showed that America could defend herself without a great standing army, and that successful invasion was perfectly hopeless. To erect a monument, then, is an appropriate duty. It is not a mere local bounty or compliment, for the whole Mississippi Valley—Kentucky, Tennessee, and Mississippi especially—shared in the glory of the defense. It belongs to the nation as a victory second only to Yorktown in its effect, and with all the glory belonging to our own people, our own soldiers, and the mighty leader of our brave defenders.

I can not more appropriately and more forcibly conclude, Mr. Chairman, than by quoting that magnetic leader of the people, Henry Clay, who said in one of the great efforts which have made his name immortal in the history of our country:

What do I mean by national glory? Glory such as Hull, Jackson, and Perry have acquired. And are gentlemen insensible to their deeds in animating the country in the hour of peril hereafter?

Did the battle of Thermopylae preserve Greece but once? While the Mississippi continues to bear the tribute of the Iron Mountains and the Alleghenies to her delta and to the Gulf of Mexico the 8th of January shall be remembered, and the glory of that day shall stimulate future patriots and nerve the arms of unborn freemen in driving the presumptuous invader from our country's soil.

[Loud applause.]

The CHAIRMAN (Mr. BENNET of New York). If there are no further demands for time, the Clerk will commence reading the bill by paragraphs.

The Clerk read as follows:

#### OFFICE OF THE CHIEF OF STAFF.

For contingent expenses of the military information division, General Staff Corps, including the purchase of law books, professional books of reference, professional and technical periodicals and newspapers, and of the military attachés at the United States embassies and legations abroad; and of the branch office of the military information division at Manila, to be expended under the direction of the Secretary of War, \$10,000: *Provided*, That section 3648, Revised Statutes, shall not apply to subscriptions for foreign and professional newspapers and periodicals to be paid for from this appropriation.

Mr. MANN. I move to strike out the last word.

There was a proposition here the other day, presented by the Committee on Appropriations, forbidding hereafter the purchase of any periodicals except technical and scientific works. I would like to ask the gentleman from Iowa whether, in his judgment, it is necessary that the War Department shall have the right to purchase the foreign professional newspapers and periodicals provided for in this bill?

Mr. HULL. Mr. Chairman, this matter was fully discussed either four or six years ago, I do not remember which, and it was shown that unless we make this provision the officers have to advance the subscription out of their own pockets and put in a bill and have it allowed to them personally. It only applies to the foreign and professional papers.

Mr. MANN. I quite agree with the gentleman, but when I raised the point of order on the proposition the other day, some of the distinguished members of the Committee on Appropriations were inclined to severely criticize me for it, and I wanted to know from the committee that has jurisdiction whether these things are needed.

Mr. HULL. These are technical matters, and thought to be of great value from a military standpoint. It is thought proper that they should have these periodicals.

The Clerk read as follows:

#### OFFICE OF THE CHIEF SIGNAL OFFICER.

Signal Service of the Army: For expenses of the Signal Service of the Army, as follows: Purchase, equipment, and repair of field electric telegraphs, signal equipments and stores, binocular glasses, telescopes, heliostats, and other necessary instruments, including necessary meteorological instruments for use on target ranges; war balloons; telephone apparatus (exclusive of exchange service) and maintenance of the same; electrical installations and maintenance at military posts; fire control and direction apparatus and material for field artillery; maintenance and repair of military telegraph lines and cables, including salaries of civilian employees, supplies, and general repairs, and other expenses connected with the duty of collecting and transmitting information for the Army by telegraph or otherwise, \$200,000.

Mr. HULL. Mr. Chairman, in the preparation of the bill there was an agreement on the part of the Committee on Military Affairs that a provision similar to the one carried in the last bill for the extension of the telegraph and cable system should be inserted in the bill, but in the make-up of the bill it was omitted. I therefore move the following amendment, to come in after the word "dollars," in line 10, page 5.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Iowa offers the following amendment, which the Clerk will report.

The Clerk read as follows:

Insert on page 5, line 10, after the word "dollars:"

"*Provided*, That of the receipts of the Washington-Alaska military cable and telegraph system that have been covered into the Treasury of the United States the sum of \$190,000 be, and the same is hereby made available for defraying the cost of such extension and betterments of the system as may be approved by the Secretary of War, the extent of such extension and the cost thereof to be reported to Congress by the Secretary of War."

Mr. TAWNEY. Mr. Chairman, I reserve the point of order on that. I believe there was an item of this kind in the last bill.

Mr. HULL. Yes.

Mr. TAWNEY. Of that appropriation how much remains unexpended?

Mr. HULL. It is practically all expended and several places are left uncompleted.

Mr. TAWNEY. The language of that provision last year was identically the same as this, was it not?

Mr. HULL. The same as this.

Mr. TAWNEY. And they have made no report of their expenditures in accordance with that provision.

Mr. HULL. I read from the statement of General Allen, in the hearings before the committee:

General ALLEN. You gave last year \$179,000. There is left out of that in the Treasury and not obligated \$22,000. It will be obligated before the end of the year. The appropriation came so late that we could not spend all of it this year. The ship is up there now. Out of that will come the amount for our work next summer.

The total amount received in revenues from the Alaskan cable up to date is \$371,827.29. Out of that you have allotted \$179,000, leaving the remainder of that fund up to the end of December approximately \$192,000.

The CHAIRMAN. That is the gross amount.

General ALLEN. Yes; it has all been turned into the Treasury.

The CHAIRMAN. And the law turned it over to Alaska to extend the cable line.

General ALLEN. Every dollar has been turned into the Treasury, so that there is still to the credit of the Alaska fund \$193,000.

They went over the map, showing where it was desired in one place to complete a cable. There is one place that connects an important starting point with a railroad, and it will benefit that railroad I will say, frankly, to the House; but it will also aid in the development of Alaska. The receipts from the telegraph, when we get this completed, will more than pay a large interest on the investment, giving the Government its business practically for nothing. The commercial receipts from the line will be largely increased, according to the evidence submitted to us, by this addition. I hope that before many years we shall be enabled to dispose of this line, so that the Government may get out of the business of building telegraphs; but, until that time does come, it seems to me that with Alaska situated as it is the Congress of the United States should aid, not only in connecting all the posts of that Territory by cable and land telegraph lines, but that it should aid in the lines that will assist in the development of the Territory itself.

Mr. TAWNEY. Mr. Chairman, if the gentleman will permit an interruption—

Mr. HULL. Certainly.

Mr. TAWNEY. I am in hearty sympathy with the purpose that the gentleman has in view. I think this cable system has contributed very much to the development of Alaska in recent years, and I think that if it is extended it will continue to do so, but I want to ask the gentleman in charge of the bill whether he thinks it is good policy for Congress to appropriate the receipts derived from this service for the extension of the cable instead of paying the money into the Treasury and then appropriating upon estimates, as in other branches of the service? They do not come, like any other branch of the Government service, when they want to extend the line, with a statement of the extensions they intend to make and an estimate of what those extensions will cost, but are given the opportunity here to make the appropriation themselves, limited only by the receipts from the service. This, in my judgment, is not good administration and it should not be permitted. We have no opportunity to inquire into the necessity of the improvement, and second, whether or not their estimate of the cost is a reasonable estimate. In other words, this is a method of making appropriations entirely inconsistent with the policy of Congress in such matters, as the gentleman well knows. It would seem to me better to make a specific appropriation for the extension of the line desired upon estimates submitted by the Department instead of turning over the receipts to be expended without any check whatever.

Mr. HULL. I suppose the check is on the authority of the Secretary of War, where it is expended. They give in the hearings the places largely where it is to be. On page 16 they

say it is proposed to extend a line from Fairbanks to Circle City. That would be 175 miles. The rest of it would be largely for betterments. It is important to put the line through Nome to the center of Alaska in first-class condition, and a great deal of money would have to be spent on it.

I fully agree with the general proposition of the gentleman from Minnesota, and I am perfectly willing that a proviso should be added providing that hereafter detailed estimates shall be submitted before any further appropriations shall be made. I am in hopes that this will complete what we have to do.

But this is a specific appropriation for a specific amount.

Mr. TAWNEY. I doubt very much whether it will. The development is so great and the demand for the service is so large that I fear it will be a good many years before it is completed. It is for the purpose of putting this service on identically the same basis with respect to appropriations and estimates, that Congress may inquire of the heads of Departments as to the necessity for the amount asked for.

Mr. HULL. If the gentleman thinks it will improve it, I will add a proviso providing that hereafter detailed estimates must be submitted before any appropriation shall be made for the continuance of this service or for further extension of these lines.

Mr. SLAYDEN. Mr. Chairman, I would like to ask the gentleman from Minnesota, who has visited Alaska and who is familiar with the conditions, if he does not believe that in a comparatively short time the Government will be able to go out of the telegraph business in the Territory? I will say that my information is that it will, and that this is merely a duplication of the experience of other parts of the frontier in the early days, when the Government built for its own use many telegraph lines on the frontier of Texas and permitted their use for commercial purposes, receiving the toll that was charged, and just as soon as it was possible to secure the maintenance of the line—the operation of the line for commercial purposes by private parties, which would serve the purposes of the Government just as well—the Government went out of the business. I was told by Major Richardson that that was the policy they expected to pursue in Alaska. If I did not believe that, I would not be in favor of this amendment and in favor of spending money for the development of these commercial enterprises to be operated by the Government.

Mr. TAWNEY. While I have great respect for the opinion of Major Richardson, whom I know personally and who is familiar with conditions in Alaska, I am constrained to believe, however, that it will be many years before any private corporation will be able to take over the Government lines and operate them successfully. I am not objecting to the extension of this line. What I am objecting to is the practice growing up in the House, where appropriation bills originate, of appropriating the receipts of a given service to be expended in the discretion of the men who are at the head of that service without any report or check on it at all. It is in the hope of getting this in line with the same policy that has always obtained of submitting estimates and statements as to the extension desired to be made and then appropriating for that specific purpose so that it can be expended for no other purpose and leave the receipts to go into the Treasury where they belong.

Mr. HULL. Mr. Chairman, I ask that the amendment be reported again. I have added a further proviso to it.

Mr. MANN. I have no objection to that, except that I do not wish to waive the privilege of having made the point of order.

The CHAIRMAN. It is understood by the House that the point of order is still reserved.

Mr. MANN. It is reserved.

The Clerk read as follows:

Insert after "dollars," page 5, line 10, the following:  
*Provided*, That of the receipts of the Washington-Alaska military cable and telegraph system that have been covered into the Treasury of the United States the sum of \$190,000 be, and the same is hereby, made available for defraying the cost of such extensions and betterments of the system as may be approved by the Secretary of War, the extent of such extensions and the cost thereof to be reported to Congress by the Secretary of War: *Provided further*, That hereafter detailed estimates shall be submitted to Congress for any further extension of the cable or telegraph lines in the Territory of Alaska."

Mr. TAWNEY. I withdraw the point of order with that proviso.

Mr. MANN. I renew the point of order.

The CHAIRMAN. The point of order is withdrawn by the gentleman from Minnesota and renewed by the gentleman from Illinois. Does the gentleman make the point of order or reserve the point of order?

Mr. MANN. If the gentleman from Iowa desires, I will reserve it.

Mr. HULL. I do not desire to have it reserved at all.

Mr. MANN. Then I make the point of order.

The CHAIRMAN. Does the gentleman from Iowa desire to discuss the point of order?

Mr. HULL. I simply want to call the attention of the Chair to the fact that this is part of a line of work the Government is already on, and it is to carry on the same work the Government has been engaged in in the past.

The CHAIRMAN. How does this proposition differ from the one ruled upon in the last Congress?

Mr. HULL. Not at all, except in the amount of money appropriated. It is a little increase, and in the last proviso requiring for the future detailed estimates.

The CHAIRMAN. In view of the ruling when this same proposition was under consideration in the last Congress, the Chair feels constrained to sustain the point of order. The Clerk will read:

The Clerk read as follows:

*Provided*, That when the office of Lieutenant-General shall become vacant it shall not thereafter be filled, but said office shall cease and determine: *Provided further*, That nothing in this provision shall affect the retired list.

Mr. COOPER of Wisconsin. Mr. Chairman, I make the point of order against the proviso that it is new legislation, and that it changes existing law.

The CHAIRMAN. Is the point of order made as against the whole paragraph?

Mr. COOPER of Wisconsin. The proviso.

The CHAIRMAN. Which proviso?

Mr. COOPER of Wisconsin. Both provisos, lines 17 to 20, inclusive.

The CHAIRMAN. The point of order is sustained. The Clerk will read.

The Clerk read as follows:

For pay of enlisted men of all grades, including recruits, \$9,000,000.

Mr. SLAYDEN. Mr. Chairman, I offer the following amendment, which I send to the desk and ask to have read.

The Clerk read as follows:

At line 23, page 5, add the following:

*Provided*, That hereafter recruit and prison companies shall have noncommissioned officers, artificers, and cooks of the numbers and grades allowed by law for companies of infantry."

Mr. MANN. I reserve the point of order on that.

Mr. SLAYDEN. Mr. Chairman, the only change proposed by that amendment really is to allow the artificer and the cook to the prison company which is now provided by law for other companies. The prison company is stationed at Fort Leavenworth, at the military prison. It does not increase the number of enlisted men, because the artificers and cooks are enlisted men. It increases the compensation of the man who is detailed by \$2 a month, and it increases the compensation of the artificer who is detailed to that work by \$2 a month. It puts these companies on exactly the same par as other companies in the Army.

Mr. MANN. I withdraw the point of order.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on agreeing to the amendment offered by the gentleman from Texas.

The question was taken; and the amendment was agreed to.

The Clerk read as follows:

ENGINEERS.

Two hundred and sixty-nine thousand six hundred and four dollars.

Mr. PARKER. Mr. Chairman, it seems to me that something must have been left out after the word "engineers" at the top of the page.

Mr. MANN. That refers to the pay of enlisted men.

Mr. PARKER. I think there is some mistake at the top of page 6, some omission of the words "for pay of enlisted men" or something of that sort. I desire to look at the estimates before we get to that. I would ask unanimous consent to return to this place, if necessary, at the top of page 6.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from New Jersey asks unanimous consent to return to page 6 for the purpose of offering an amendment?

Mr. PARKER. Yes.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection?

Mr. MANN. I suppose the gentleman does not know. We can not tell exactly how this comes in this shape. It is merely a matter of printing the bill.

Mr. PARKER. No; it is more than that. The previous paragraph is for pay of enlisted men, and instead of those words "the pay of enlisted men of all grades" on the top of page 6 you will find simply the word "engineers," and I think there must be some provision for somebody.

Mr. HULL. The language follows the bill as it has been reported to the House for the last quarter of a century. That has always been the language.



Mr. PARKER. I will ask unanimous consent to return to this until I can see an old bill.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from New Jersey asks unanimous consent that the paragraph on the top of page 6 be passed without prejudice. Is there objection?

Mr. MANN. I would say that the same objection applies to the entire two pages of the bill. There is no object in reserving the one and proposing an amendment there.

Mr. PARKER. Mr. Chairman, I withdraw the request.

The Clerk read as follows:

*Provided further,* That section 169 of the Revised Statutes of 1878 be amended to read as follows:

"Sec. 169. That each head of a department or independent bureau or officer of the Army in command at any army headquarters or post or the office of the Chief of Staff is authorized to employ in his department or bureau, or in any branch or division thereof or at such army headquarters or post or in the office of the Chief of Staff, where-soever located, such number of clerks of the several classes recognized by law, and such messengers, assistant messengers, copyists, watchmen, laborers, and other employees at such rates of compensation, respectively, as may be appropriated for by Congress from year to year."

Mr. TAWNEY. Mr. Chairman, I reserve the point of order on this paragraph. I want to ask the chairman of the committee if he is aware of the fact that by enacting this provision you repeal the law authorizing the appointment of clerks in all the Executive Departments of the Government here in Washington?

Mr. HULL. I am not aware of that.

Mr. TAWNEY. Well, that is the fact. If the gentleman will turn to section 169 of the statutes—well, the language of this amendment will explain it to you. Section 169 of the Revised Statutes authorizes the appointment of such clerks in the Executive Departments here in Washington for whom Congress may from time to time appropriate.

Mr. HULL. Yes.

Mr. TAWNEY. Now, you amend section 169 by eliminating the authority for the appointment of any clerks whatever in the Executive Departments here in Washington, making section 169 apply only to the Army, where to-day it applies to all the Executive Departments.

Mr. HULL. That may be so, but we followed the report of the Committee on the Judiciary entirely in the matter, and that committee reported this as only an extension.

Mr. TAWNEY. Then the joke is on the Committee on the Judiciary and not on the Committee on Military Affairs.

Mr. HULL. I have here the report of the Committee on the Judiciary stating with this change it simply includes divisions, etc., of the Army. I will say very frankly to the gentleman I never read the statute when the matter was before us, and have accepted the report of the Judiciary Committee as correct.

Mr. TAWNEY. Section 169 reads as follows:

Each head of a Department is authorized to employ in his Department such number of clerks of the several classes recognized by law, and such messengers, assistant messengers, copyists, watchmen, laborers, and other employees at such rates of compensation, respectively, as may be appropriated for by Congress from year to year.

Now, your proposed amendment to the section would make it read as follows: "That each head of Department or independent bureau, or officer of the Army in command at any Army headquarters," and eliminating entirely the authority for the appointment of clerks here in the Executive Departments in Washington.

Mr. HULL. Well, I will say to the gentleman that very largely this comes from the amendment reported from the Judiciary Committee. The original bill was that each head of a Department or officer of the Army.

Mr. MANN. Will the gentleman from Iowa yield for a second?

Mr. HULL. Yes.

Mr. MANN. The gentleman from Minnesota thinks this would restrict existing law. I think it would very much extend the existing law.

Mr. TAWNEY. It would extend it if enacted as the committee intended it should be enacted.

Mr. MANN. The existing law provides for each head of a Department. The gentleman from Minnesota thinks it reads each head of a department in the Army; but in addition to that it provides for each independent bureau. The independent bureaus which have nothing to do with the Army ought not to be allowed upon an Army appropriation bill, and if the belief of the gentleman from Minnesota is correct then this ought not to be in the bill; and if, on the other hand, it applies to independent bureaus not connected with the Army it ought not to be in the bill.

Mr. TAWNEY. I do not think so either.

Mr. HULL. It ought to be in the bill only to the extent of enlarging the existing law to cover simply the divisions and

departments of the Army that have always had clerks. Now, I think in the way the committee has reported it it may be subject to the objection of the gentleman from Minnesota. The present law now reads, as I understand it, "each head of a department is authorized to employ in his department such number of clerks of the several classes recognized by law, and such messengers, assistant messengers, copyists, watchmen, laborers, and other employees at such rates of compensation, respectively, as may be appropriated for by Congress from year to year." Now, that is the present law.

Mr. MANN. That is the way this reads.

Mr. HULL. What we want to do is to include the Chief of Staff and the divisions and departments of the Army for whom these clerks are provided. It was held by the chairman of the committee last year that there was no law. There have always been departments in the Army, a general commanding the Army, now Chief of Staff; there has always been a military division where we had to have clerks outside of those here in the Department, and in order to prevent clerks who are employed here from being transferred to the field and clerks employed in the field, at Chicago, for instance, outside of the Department, from being transferred to the bureaus and having it so they could always be controlled, some six years ago, possibly eight years ago, when Mr. Moody was on the Committee on Appropriations, we agreed to this provision, that none of them should be assigned to duty in any of the bureaus of the Department, so as to keep them separate.

Mr. MANN. If the gentleman will permit me to state, I will say that we do not have any independent bureaus in the War Department.

Mr. HULL. No; but we have bureaus under the Department.

Mr. MANN. But this does not say "bureaus;" it says "independent bureaus." An independent bureau is one entirely out of any Department.

Mr. TAWNEY. It would apply to such an independent organization as the Interstate Commerce Commission, for instance.

Mr. MANN. It would apply to the Bureau of Fisheries if that were not included in the Department of Commerce and Labor, for instance.

Mr. HULL. The Committee on Military Affairs has no desire to enlarge the law except to provide for clerks, messengers, and laborers at headquarters and divisions.

Mr. MANN. This matter is now pending on a report introduced, and we will soon take that up for consideration.

Mr. HULL. I have no objection on earth—

Mr. PARKER. May I ask the gentleman how he would take it up?

Mr. MANN. It was only the other day that the Judiciary Committee was called on the call of the committees to take up a number of matters, and declined to take up any more.

Mr. PARKER. It is on the Union Calendar, and therefore could not be taken up.

Mr. MANN. The gentleman misunderstands the rule. The Committee on the Judiciary occupied the time of the House more than an hour the other day on the call of committees, and voluntarily gave its time, and it was moved at that time to go into Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for consideration of bills on the Union Calendar, and they did not do it. That is not our fault. At the next opportunity that comes they can do it, I may say to the gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. PARKER].

Mr. HULL. Mr. Chairman, this amendment is evidently not what we intended. It goes much further than that—

Mr. TAWNEY. Mr. Chairman, I insist upon the point of order.

Mr. HULL (continuing). And am willing to let it go out.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. TAWNEY] insists upon the point of order. The Chair sustains the point of order and understands that it refers to that part after the word "department," in line 5, down to and including line 19.

Mr. HULL. After the word "department" down to and including the word "year" in line 19.

The Clerk read as follows:

For Chief of Bureau of Insular Affairs, \$5,500.

Mr. MANN. Mr. Chairman, I reserve the point of order upon that paragraph, namely, lines 18 and 19, page 13, for the purpose of asking in reference to it. I really do not know whether it is subject to a point of order or not.

Mr. HULL. It is provided by law that the chief of the Bureau of Insular Affairs shall have the pay and allowance of brigadier-general while so serving, and this is simply in pursuance of law.

Mr. MANN. Mr. Chairman, I withdraw the point of order.

Mr. FITZGERALD. Mr. Chairman, I renew the point of

order. I desire to inquire how the salary of this officer is carried in this particular bill.

Mr. HULL. Because all the salaries for all the Army officers are carried in this bill. The law provides for the detail of an Army officer for chief of the Bureau.

Mr. FITZGERALD. There are other Army officers and some naval officers detailed to positions that are considered civil positions, and their compensation is provided in different bills, and not in the Army or naval bill.

Mr. HULL. I do not know of any officer serving in a bureau in the War Department whose pay is not carried in this bill.

Mr. FITZGERALD. The supervisor of the port of New York is a naval officer with the rank of commander, appointed by the President, by and with the advice and consent of the Senate, and his compensation is not carried in the naval bill. It is carried in the sundry civil bill, if I am not mistaken, and if this officer is detailed to perform the duties of a civil office his salary should be carried in the sundry civil bill and not in the military appropriation bill.

Mr. HULL. They have had a chief of the Bureau of Insular Affairs ever since the Spanish war. His rank was that of colonel until this year. By an independent act of Congress the grade was increased from that of colonel to that of brigadier-general.

Mr. MANN. Is this General Edwards's office?

Mr. HULL. Yes. It is a bureau of the War Department proper, not away from here; in no sense like the case in New York, where a man is serving in another employment entirely outside of the Navy. This is under the direction of the Secretary of War and is a bureau of the War Department.

Mr. FITZGERALD. Is this pay in addition to his salary as a brigadier-general?

Mr. HULL. No; it is his full pay.

Mr. FITZGERALD. Why is he not paid as a part of the military service?

Mr. HULL. All the appropriations for the staff are separate. When we refer to The Military Secretary we give the amount of pay for his department. When we refer to the Judge-Advocate we give his salary and the salaries of his assistants.

Mr. FITZGERALD. Now, why is it this has not existed before?

Mr. MANN. So that this is really a division of the bureaus and the different officials?

Mr. HULL. That is all. If he had an assistant, we would have to put in the pay for him; but as he is the only officer of this character in here, there is no pay provided for an assistant. If you remember, there was a time in the Record and Pension Division when there was but one man at the head, Captain Ainsworth, first as a captain, then as major, then as colonel, and brigadier-general. When the work was enlarged he had an assistant given him, and the assistant also was carried in the appropriation; and it is so with the Judge-Advocate and all the assistant judge-advocates; they are all carried in this bill as staff corps, separate from the line.

Mr. MANN. If this is the provision for Brigadier-General Edwards, my only regret is that the amount is not larger, as he is one of the men who earns a great deal more than he gets.

Mr. HULL. There is no question about the amount being properly here and no question of its being in pursuance of existing law.

Mr. FITZGERALD. If the gentleman will give me some attention, I will ask him what I tried to before. Why has it been segregated this year in this way when it has not been in other years?

Mr. HULL. It had been segregated heretofore when his pay was that of colonel.

Mr. FITZGERALD. My recollection is that he was paid out of the general appropriation for the pay of the Army. There was no such provision as this in the last year's bill.

Mr. HULL. He was carried as an officer of the line before.

Mr. TAWNEY. Is there any reason why he will not or could not be paid as an officer of the line if this appropriation was not made?

Mr. HULL. Yes; because by law we have taken him out of the line and placed him on the list of brigadier-generals in the staff.

Mr. FITZGERALD. That is the information I desired. Until this year he was paid out of the general appropriation.

Mr. KEIFER. But he will perform this service no longer in the line.

Mr. TAWNEY. He was paid as a line officer.

Mr. KEIFER. He will get more pay under this.

Mr. HULL. This is in lieu of that.

Mr. KEIFER. Therefore he can not be paid as a line officer.

Mr. TAWNEY. His pay comes out of the appropriation for line officers under the military appropriation bill.

Mr. HULL. Mr. Chairman, if that is true, then there is a crime being committed in the War Department.

Mr. TAWNEY. If it is not so, will the gentleman indicate why?

Mr. HULL. Because we have a law now that provides that the chief of the Insular Bureau may be detailed from the line for a period of four years, unless sooner removed by the President, and while so serving he shall have the rank, pay, and allowances of a brigadier-general, and we appropriate his full salary here. Now, if he gets his pay from the line, from his lineal rank, and his pay on this detail as brigadier-general, there is a crime being committed by the War Department, and I do not believe that any such thing is possible.

Mr. FITZGERALD. Well, the gentleman is supposed to have this information. Will he read the provision of the current law under which the head of this Bureau is now paid?

Mr. HULL. It was passed by the last Congress.

Mr. FITZGERALD. Has the gentleman that information?

Mr. HULL. I do not carry all the provisions of the various acts in my head or keep all the acts in my desk, and if the gentleman challenges this statement I have made as to the law, then I will have to get it in this case.

Mr. FITZGERALD. It is right there, and I am trying to get the information.

Mr. HULL. The date of the act is all that we have in the estimates. I have quoted almost the entire act and the conditions under which he gets the rank, pay, and allowance of a brigadier-general. It is not necessary to quote the provision in the appropriation bill each time an appropriation bill is passed.

Mr. FITZGERALD. I want to say to the gentleman that this is the first law that gave that.

Mr. TAWNEY. As I understand, before the present chief of the Insular Bureau was promoted to the rank of brigadier-general by an act of Congress, he was a colonel.

Mr. HULL. He was not a colonel in the line, but he got the pay of a colonel.

Mr. TAWNEY. Prior to that he received the pay of a colonel?

Mr. HULL. Yes.

Mr. TAWNEY. And performed the duties of chief of the Insular Bureau at that time?

Mr. HULL. Yes.

Mr. TAWNEY. Now, does the act promoting him to the rank of brigadier-general provide for the payment of his compensation as chief of the Insular Bureau during the fiscal year 1907, or does it provide for his pay as a brigadier-general during the present fiscal year? In other words, how is he being paid now; out of what appropriation?

Mr. HULL. He receives the pay of a brigadier-general now.

Mr. FITZGERALD. How—out of what appropriation?

Mr. TAWNEY. Out of what appropriation is he being paid?

Mr. HULL. The law promoting him gives him the right to that pay.

Mr. FITZGERALD. He may have a claim, but how is he getting his money?

Mr. MANN. I understand it was appropriated for in the general deficiency bill last year. Can the gentleman from New York tell us about that?

Mr. FITZGERALD. I do not know. I can not say about that.

Mr. TAWNEY. I can tell the gentleman that it was not in the deficiency bill.

Mr. MANN. I have been told that it was in the general deficiency law of last year.

Mr. HULL. I will say to the gentleman that the question has never been brought before us, except that here was the law, and we appropriated under it. When he was paid under the other law he was probably paid under the appropriation for the pay of the line.

Mr. TAWNEY. How is he being paid this year?

Mr. HULL. I suppose he is paid out of the line officers' pay.

Mr. KEIFER. When was the act passed which promoted him to the rank of a brigadier-general?

Mr. TAWNEY. In the closing hours of the last session of Congress.

Mr. KEIFER. Then his salary could not have been appropriated for in the last Army appropriation bill.

Mr. HULL. The law promoting him to be a brigadier-general expressly provided that while so serving he should have the rank, pay, and allowances of a brigadier-general.

Mr. KEIFER. This is the first time we could appropriate for



it in the Army appropriation bill, because I am told it was in the last days of the last session that this provision making him a brigadier-general became a law.

Mr. FITZGERALD. The gentleman from Iowa [Mr. HULL] said that if he was being paid out of the appropriation for the line, a crime was being committed. Now, what appropriation is he being paid out of?

Mr. HULL. There is this to be said about it, that when the law made the provision, under the paragraph on page 18, any surplus from one fund for the pay of the Army would go to make up any deficiency in any man's pay.

Mr. FITZGERALD. The gentleman from Iowa specifically stated that if he was now being paid out of the appropriation for the line, a crime was being committed.

Mr. HULL. Oh, no; I said that if we made this appropriation and gave him full pay here and then he took his pay on his lineal rank in addition that that would be a crime.

Mr. FITZGERALD. There was no such claim as that made.

Mr. HULL. That is what I understood the gentleman to say.

Mr. KEIFER. You said he was getting his pay.

Mr. FITZGERALD. Oh, no. Let me answer the gentleman from Iowa, so he will know the question I am asking. I am asking him whether at present the chief of this Bureau is being paid from the general appropriation for the pay of officers?

Mr. HULL. I think there is no question of that, and that he will be until this bill becomes a law.

Mr. FITZGERALD. That is what I tried to find out. This provision, then, is put in in pursuance of the law that gives this man the rank, pay, and allowances of a brigadier-general.

Mr. TAWNEY. Yes.

Mr. HULL. In pursuance of the law creating the office of brigadier-general for the Bureau of which he is chief.

Mr. FITZGERALD. Then I will withdraw the point of order.

The CHAIRMAN. The point of order is withdrawn, and the Clerk will read.

The Clerk read as follows:

For interest on soldiers' deposits, \$100,000, and so much as may be necessary to pay back such deposits.

Mr. MANN. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word. I want to ask for a little information. In reference to soldiers' deposits, what does the Government do with the money that is deposited by the soldiers upon which we pay this interest?

Mr. HULL. The Government uses it as all the funds of the Government are used—in any line they desire.

Mr. MANN. The gentleman says use it. We have no use for it.

Mr. HULL. We may have no use for it at all. The object of it, I will say to the gentleman, is that it has long been the settled policy of the Government to induce the saving on the part of the soldiers, and the Government pays the soldiers 4 per cent interest on it, giving that amount of interest even when the Government can borrow money at 2 per cent.

Mr. MANN. I have no objection to the policy; I believe in it; but in connection with the very wide discussion which is going on and has been going on for some time in reference to postal savings banks, it is proper to consider what the Government now does with the fund that it takes as the savings of these soldiers. It is practically paying interest on money without the use of the money.

Mr. YOUNG rose.

Mr. HULL. I will yield to the gentleman from Michigan.

Mr. YOUNG. I would like to say to the gentleman from Illinois that that matter was provided for in 1872 by section 1350 of the Revised Statutes.

Mr. MANN. I am sorry it was not provided for one hundred years ago. It has been a good thing, and the only regret I have is that you have reduced the appropriation \$43,000.

Mr. HULL. No; this is an estimate from year to year, and we have appropriated what the estimate called for.

Mr. MANN. We are paying 4 per cent annually. Last year you appropriated \$143,000 to pay this interest, and this year you propose to appropriate only \$100,000. What is the trouble with the Army?

Mr. HULL. It does vary up and down. That is a question of estimate by the Department.

Mr. YOUNG. The gentleman from Illinois must understand that some years soldiers withdraw more money than they do in other years, and, of course, the Government then pays less interest. That is the reason that this amount varies from year to year. This fund forms a part of the fund for the payment of the men. It is so provided by statute, and it is used for that purpose by the Government and a portion of the money appropriated for the pay of the Army.

Mr. MANN. It strikes me that it shows something is wrong about the Army. The fund is decreasing, and it ought to be increasing.

Mr. HULL. It does vary from year to year; it may go up one year and down the next.

Mr. MANN. It ought not to vary any more than the ordinary deposits in a savings bank. There are no such variations in the deposits of savings banks.

Mr. HULL. But in this case you are confronted with the proposition that 3,000 men have gone out and no enlistment to take their places. If you recruit the Army up, you will have more depositors; if the Army goes down, you will have less. It is a matter of computation by those having charge of the estimates, according to the size of the Army, and the amount, as I say, of the deposits will vary from year to year.

Mr. SCOTT. What is the reduction the gentleman spoke of?

Mr. HULL. I think in the artillery branch alone it is nearly 3,000. The conditions that prevail in the country to-day are not such as to largely facilitate the enlistment of men. The employment of labor is so great, men get all the employment that they can possibly ask for at remunerative wages, and that tends to call off the class of men that would otherwise go into the Army. Another reason that affects the artillery is that one term of service makes a large number of expert electricians; not expert in the highest sense, but expert in the common work of electric companies, both for cities and large corporations, and they do not reenlist.

Mr. SCOTT. In that connection I would like to inquire whether this bill makes any provision to correct that evil?

Mr. HULL. No; and under our rules it can not, but I hope within the next ten days to offer a bill which will tend to correct it.

Mr. SCOTT. By increasing the wages or salary of these men whose training makes them expert?

Mr. HULL. Yes.

Mr. KAHN. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last two words.

The CHAIRMAN. The pro forma amendment of the gentleman from Illinois will be withdrawn.

Mr. KAHN. The evidence before the committee shows another reason why the Army is not recruited to its full strength and why there is a constant falling off from the strength of the Army. It is due to the fact that there is no canteen; that, as a matter of fact, many men get temporary leave of absence to go away from the post, and instead of going to a reputable place to drink they go into low brothels, become drunk, and they fail to return to their posts, and become deserters. Now, the evidence before the committee shows that that is a condition, unfortunately, that does prevail in the American Army, and probably if the canteen were restored, there would not be so many desertions from the Army.

Mr. SCOTT. Will the gentleman permit an inquiry?

Mr. KAHN. Yes.

Mr. SCOTT. Was that evidence unanimous, or was it disputed?

Mr. KAHN. Well, mostly every Army officer who came before the committee who was questioned upon the subject stated that that was the fact.

Mr. SCOTT. Of course it is a matter of opinion, is it not, rather than of fact?

Mr. KAHN. I imagine that it is opinion based upon actual experience.

Mr. BARTHOLDT. Will the gentleman permit another suggestion?

Mr. KAHN. Certainly.

Mr. BARTHOLDT. Does he not think that the recent deplorable affair at Brownsville might have been avoided if the soldiers had had an opportunity to remain in the barracks and satisfy their desires with a mild beverage instead of being compelled to go outside and drink the poisonous stuff that is being served in these dives?

Mr. KAHN. Well, I will say frankly to the gentleman that I do not know the conditions that prevailed in Brownsville, but I do know the conditions that prevail in San Francisco, which is a large Army post. I know that when the soldiers get a furlough they go to the lowest dives in the city and become drunk, and many of them fail to return to the post. If they had a canteen to go to the chances are 99 in 100 that they would not desert from the Army.

The CHAIRMAN. Without objection, the pro forma amendment will be withdrawn.

The Clerk read as follows:

For subsistence, mileage, and commutation of quarters to officers of the National Guard attending service and garrison schools, \$10,000.

Mr. TAWNEY. Mr. Chairman, I reserve the point of order on this paragraph. I desire to ask the chairman of the committee if this is not an entirely new provision?

Mr. HULL. Yes.

Mr. TAWNEY. Now, we are appropriating annually \$2,000,000 for the support of the militia.

Mr. HULL. Yes.

Mr. TAWNEY. Is it not a fact that Congress contemplated, when it made this appropriation or increased the appropriation at the last session of Congress from one million to two millions of dollars, that that was to defray all of the expense that the Government should bear in connection with the militia, including the officers and their attendance upon any encampment or school that they might be called upon or given the privilege to attend?

Mr. HULL. Mr. Chairman, in answer I would say that if that was intended when the extra million was voted it failed. The provision which requires this payment is the so-called "Dick Act," which provided that the Government should pay this class of expense, and it has been heretofore paid out of the appropriation for the transportation of the Army and its supplies, I think, entirely. This is simply to segregate and make plain how much we appropriate for this purpose. I want to say to the gentleman that when we come to that item of transportation of the Army and its supplies the committee has incorporated another provision requiring hereafter the estimate for transportation and supplies under one head and detailed estimates for all the other items carried in that large provision. The militia act requires the payment by the General Government of these charges, and when we gave them the additional million of dollars for the militia it only applied to the same lines of expenditures for the militia that the first million stood upon the statute books of the country for years applied to.

Mr. TAWNEY. Then, if I understand the gentleman, while this provision is new, the service for which the expenditure is made is of long standing?

Mr. HULL. It is of long standing—ever since the passage of the Dick militia bill.

Mr. TAWNEY. And the payments have heretofore been made out of the item for transportation and supplies?

Mr. HULL. That is my recollection. They have always paid it, and they have in this simply segregated the item here so that Congress may know the amounts they were paying for this education of the militia officers.

Mr. TAWNEY. I did not know but that we were embarking upon a new service.

Mr. HULL. Not at all. It is provided in the Dick bill that this must be paid out of the appropriation for the Army.

Mr. TAWNEY. Mr. Chairman, I withdraw the point of order. The Clerk read as follows:

Noncommissioned officers and privates, 50 companies, \$497,131.20.

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word. I would like to ask the chairman of the committee a question for information. When does this Porto Rican regiment end its career by operation of law?

Mr. HULL. I think with this appropriation bill.

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. I am glad to hear that.

Mr. HULL. My recollection is—I may be mistaken in the year, but I think not—that the extension was made for four years in 1904, and it will expire in 1908. I understand the gentleman is referring to the Porto Rican regiment only and not to the Philippine scouts.

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. Yes; the Porto Rican regiment.

Mr. HULL. Because the Philippine Scouts are permanent law.

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. Yes; I know that. I withdraw the pro forma amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

For paying the expenses of regiments, battalions, squadrons, and batteries of the organized militia of any State, Territory, or of the District of Columbia which may be authorized by the Secretary of War to participate in such brigade or division encampments as may be established for the field instruction of the troops of the Regular Army, as provided by sections 15 and 21 of the act of January 21, 1903, entitled "An act to promote the efficiency of the militia, and for other purposes," \$1,000,000.

Mr. HAY. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the paragraph. I do not intend to discuss this question at any great length, because the chairman of the committee called attention to it when he was speaking on the bill the other day. I think that it is not necessary to have this appropriation every year. It seems to me that having it once in two years is sufficient and all that ought to be done. Not only does it cost the million dollars provided for in the paragraph, but in addition to that it increases the appropriation for the Army about a million dollars, making in all two millions. Therefore I hope that the committee will strike out the paragraph.

Mr. TAWNEY. Will the gentleman permit a question?

Mr. HAY. Certainly.

Mr. TAWNEY. On what theory do you maintain that the appropriation should be made every two years instead of annually? Is it because they are not called out in this service or do not need to be called out?

Mr. HAY. Yes; I do not think they need to be called out.

Mr. TAWNEY. Your theory is the practice they get every two years will be sufficient for military purposes.

Mr. HAY. Ample sufficient.

Mr. YOUNG. Mr. Chairman, I hope that the motion of the gentleman from Virginia will not prevail. Under the present system of maneuvers our first year—namely, last year—was a great success. We had before us the Assistant Secretary of War and he said upon this question:

The CHAIRMAN. Page 22 you have an appropriation for the organized militia troops participating in camps of the Regular Army. Is it intended to have maneuvers this year?

Secretary OLIVER. We hope to put the regular troops under canvas, and if our scheme is carried out we will get the militia to participate.

The CHAIRMAN. Just as you did during the past year?

Secretary OLIVER. Yes, sir. Last year we did that experimentally, just to see how it would work. Apparently it has been a very great success. I have letters from most all the governors of the States in favor of it. We found last year that \$700,000 was inadequate, as the States spent \$125,000 outside of our appropriation, while twelve States did not take part in the camps.

And he then goes on to say that they hope to keep this camp this year for ten days instead of one week, as last year.

Mr. MANN. May I ask the gentleman a question? Is that the reason for the increase of \$300,000 in the proposed appropriation of this year over last year?

Mr. YOUNG. It is because they wish to extend the time and because they wish to give an opportunity to these other twelve States to participate.

Mr. MANN. Then a million dollars would not be sufficient. I suppose next year it will be a million and half.

Mr. YOUNG. No; I think not.

Mr. MANN. If they all participate and you extend the time, why does the gentleman think not?

Mr. YOUNG. I think it will not be necessary. I think a million dollars will be sufficient for years and I do think—

Mr. FITZGERALD. Will the gentleman yield for a question?

Mr. YOUNG. In just a moment. And I do think that there is no money expended for the benefit of the Army that gives greater and better results than this. It seems to me to be a matter of the utmost folly to try to have an organized militia or national guard and not give them the very best possible opportunity to learn the art of war, and that they can only do by participation to some extent with the regular troops.

Mr. FITZGERALD. I desire to know whether these maneuvers are conducted for the purpose of benefiting the men or the high officers?

Mr. YOUNG. They are conducted for the benefit of the Regular Army and for the militia. Our Army up to this time has been distributed mostly in small posts. There are few opportunities for large bodies of troops, such as a brigade, even to act together and maneuver together, and the purpose of this provision is to get brigades together and with them call in the members of the National Guard to assist them, and train both the men of the Regular Army and the men of the national guard, not the officers, but mostly the men. Of course it is a benefit to both.

Mr. FITZGERALD. One regiment of militia is taken from each State?

Mr. YOUNG. At least that.

Mr. FITZGERALD. Do they take more than one?

Mr. YOUNG. They have not so far.

Mr. FITZGERALD. How many years would it take for the National Guard of the State of New York, for instance, to get the benefit of this instruction?

Mr. YOUNG. We hope in a State like New York to have more than one regiment. We hope to have more than one regiment this year.

Mr. FITZGERALD. But the policy of the Department has made it impossible to take more than one regiment.

Mr. YOUNG. Oh, not the policy of the Department, but the policy of Congress, which only appropriated \$700,000 for this purpose.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. HULL. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Michigan have such time as he may desire.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Iowa asks unanimous consent that the gentleman from Michigan have such time as he desire. Is there objection? [After a pause.] The Chair hears none.

Mr. KAHN. Mr. Chairman—



Mr. YOUNG. I yield to the gentleman from California.

Mr. KAHN. Is it not a fact that the very purpose of having this appropriation annually is to take in different regiments every year from the various States, in order that they may all have an opportunity of learning the art of war in time of peace?

Mr. YOUNG. That is precisely so.

Mr. McCLEARY of Minnesota. Is it contemplated that the States shall make any contribution toward the expense?

Mr. YOUNG. That is as the States may wish. They have in the past contributed something in addition of their own free will.

Mr. MANN. Have they contributed anything of their own funds in addition to the \$1,000,000 which Congress contributes to them otherwise?

Mr. YOUNG. Their own funds.

Mr. KAHN. As I understand it, this money pays the traveling expenses of the State troops to the place of encampment. The expenses of the troops while at the encampment are, as I understand it, borne by the State.

Mr. YOUNG. That is true.

Mr. MANN. They just made an appropriation in here to pay commutation of quarters for the officers. Will the gentleman yield for a question?

Mr. YOUNG. Certainly.

Mr. MANN. The proposition has been made in some quarters, and the gentleman is more familiar with it than I am, that instead of having this encampment every year to which one regiment from a State shall be sent, that the Government of the United States shall send a regiment of the Regular Army to the State encampment, where all of the State militia may have a better opportunity of observing the national regiment. What is the comparative value of these two propositions?

Mr. YOUNG. I would say to the gentleman that both of those propositions have merit, and that it is the intention of the War Department now to some extent to send regiments to State encampments. That matter was gone over by Secretary Oliver in his hearings before the committee this year, and it is said that that will be with no additional expense to the Government. The troops will be sent there and paid out of the transportation of the Army.

Mr. MANN. The gentleman says "no additional expense, of course." I would say there would be "additional expense, of course." It is not possible to send a regiment of the Regular Army to an encampment without expense.

Mr. YOUNG. There will be no more transportation in the aggregate in the Army in doing that than there would be if it was not done.

Mr. MANN. Certainly the gentleman does not claim that sending a regiment of the Regular Army to a State encampment does not mean some expense?

Mr. YOUNG. If they were not sent there, they would be moved somewhere else.

Mr. MANN. Is it the policy of the War Department to keep the regular regiments on the railroads all the time?

Mr. YOUNG. For one reason or another they would have to be moved.

Mr. MANN. They do not have to be moved to this place. It can not be done without expense, and I do not see where the Regular Army authorities get authority, for no purpose connected with the Army, to send a regiment, for instance, from Fort Sheridan, in Illinois, to Springfield, in Illinois, in order to be observed by the State militia.

Mr. YOUNG. Well, the gentleman can study that question at his leisure.

Mr. MANN. No; I am trying to get light from the gentleman.

Mr. YOUNG. The "gentleman" is not discussing that question, and I will say that the gentleman from Illinois, in his hours of leisure and with his great studiousness, might devote, perhaps, some of his time, possibly, to that inquiry.

Mr. MANN. Well, I am inclined to think that somebody connected with Congress might do it, and if the gentleman who is connected with the Committee on Military Affairs declines to state the question, I suppose it will become necessary for some of the rest of us to do it; but we would like to obtain information from the people who ought to know it.

Mr. YOUNG. Of course the Commander in Chief of the Army has the right to move the Army for any military purpose to any part of the United States, and if it is thought for the benefit of the Army to move a part of it to some point where the National Guard is gathered at the time, unquestionably he has that authority and power, and it might be a wise exercise of his discretion. I believe, however, as I said before, that this provision which we are really discussing is one of the most important in this bill and that it ought to remain in it.

Such I know is the opinion of the officers of the Army; such

I know is the opinion of the Secretary of War and his assistant and all those who have studied the question.

Mr. MANN. Will the gentleman yield for another question?

Mr. HULL. Is the gentleman addressing me?

Mr. MANN. I wanted to ask somebody in connection with the committee in reference to the damages growing out of these encampments. We have a number of bills before the House to pay damages caused by soldiers at these places, as it is claimed. And there have been Army boards to pass on these claims.

Mr. HULL. Is the gentleman asking me that question?

Mr. MANN. I am making the inquiry and endeavoring to get an answer to the question.

Mr. YOUNG. I suppose that is true.

Mr. HULL. If the gentleman has asked me, I will take pleasure in answering. Of course every time we have an encampment there will be some damages growing out of it. Two years ago the War Department took the precaution to ascertain the damages immediately, in order that they might adjust it, and in that way there was but little trouble respecting the maneuvers at Manassas, but a great deal of trouble growing out of the maneuvers in Kentucky some years ago, and whatever damages there may be done the Government will be under a moral, if not a legal, obligation to pay. You will always have damages where you have maneuvers. In some cases it will be more and in some less, but this bill is only for the encampment, and the amount appropriated for it is provided in the bill.

Mr. MANN. Does the gentleman think, when he knows that these claims for damages are never likely to be paid, that they should pay them in one place and an equally large amount of claims in another should remain unpaid?

Mr. HULL. My impression is that when the Department has taken the precaution at the time of the maneuvers to adjust the damages at once and submit it that they can be paid, and should be, out of the appropriations.

Mr. MANN. There has been no such claim paid by Congress, it seems to me.

Mr. HULL. It has been paid for the maneuvers at Manassas, and most of them in full, out of the appropriation.

Mr. MANN. They have been paid out of the appropriation, then. That is what I wanted to find out—why one man got his claim paid out of the appropriation and another had his claim allowed by the War Department, but they said they had no appropriation.

Mr. HULL. In my judgment, that comes from the fact that in the first of the maneuvers too large an amount was expended on other matters. Take the maneuvers they had at Manassas, where they spent a million dollars in one week on a dress parade that was of no benefit to the country; then take the case of the encampment in Kentucky, where they had a large amount of damage. It was paid in the one case out of the allotment. The adjustment was made at the same time, and the settlement was made with the parties, and whenever they have saved enough of the allotment for each camp they have paid.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Michigan is entitled to the floor.

Mr. MANN. There was a board of officers appointed—

Mr. YOUNG. I yield the floor.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Michigan is entitled to the floor.

Mr. MANN. The gentleman from Michigan has yielded the floor.

Mr. HULL. I ask that I may have ten minutes on this subject.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection? [After a pause.] The Chair hears none.

Mr. SMITH of Kentucky. Before the gentleman proceeds I should like to correct one misstatement that he made, not intentionally, of course, that the claims at West Point were all adjusted immediately. There was a board appointed to adjust those claims, and they did adjust them. They scaled them from nearly \$30,000 to less than \$3,000, and those claims are not paid to this day, though it has been more than three years ago.

Mr. HULL. All I can say, Mr. Chairman, is that they should be paid.

Mr. SMITH of Kentucky. I think so, and I would be glad if the gentleman would consent that a provision should go into this bill for the payment of the amount that the Secretary recommends.

Mr. HULL. If an amendment is offered to this bill making that provision, I will not make any point of order, although this committee has no jurisdiction over claims. I want to speak a few minutes on the proposition involved in this mat-

ter. I think it is well known to all members of the Military Committee and the House that personally I am not in favor of these large maneuvers of the Army every year. I do not believe that the militia gets the benefit from them that it is intended that the militia should have. Take my own State, for instance, where we have two brigades. One regiment, and one only, goes to the encampment. If you could send from the regular force a regiment of infantry, a squadron of cavalry, and two batteries of artillery, under command of a brigadier-general of the Regular Army, to my State (and I am using that only as an illustration), to remain there during all the encampments of the militia, continuing for a month's time, every regiment of the militia would have the benefit of this instruction. But that proposition is not before the House at this time. I hope that that will be the policy in the future.

I am not willing to support the motion to strike this out, because if it is stricken out we have nothing to take its place. I believe that the maneuvers last year did great good, especially to the Regular Army, but very little good to the militia, because so small a number of regiments in the different States took any part in them. I do not believe these general rendezvous at four or five places in the United States will ever be available for the militia of the States generally, because the constitution of the militia regiments is such that men can not leave their business for any great length of time. They can not spare the time. Their soldiering is only an incident. The Regular Army, of course, can be concentrated at any time, and the men can remain in camp as long as the Government desires, but members of the militia regiments make their living in private life, and can not afford the time to go to distant parts of the country, even where their expenses are paid; but under the State laws they do go into State encampments every year, and they can have two weeks of actual information, instruction, and drill for each of the brigades, under Regular Army officers, if we take the Regular Army to the States in place of trying to take the States to the Regular Army. I believe this was of enough benefit last year to justify what we then expended. There is nothing better offered for this year. The committee determined that this was better than the ideas that I had on the subject. I hope that the gentleman from Virginia [Mr. HAY] will not press his motion for that reason.

Mr. HAY. Mr. Chairman, I feel constrained to press the motion that I have made, because I would not have made it if I had not thought it was wise to do so. So far as I have been able to learn, I have not been able to find that these maneuvers have been of much benefit to the National Guard. If this million dollars was spent in the States and in instructing the National Guard of the States I would be much more willing to vote for it. I do not believe that three or four days spent by the National Guard at one of these encampments of the Regular Army can be of much benefit. They are taken there from long distances. They only stay there three days at the outside, I believe the evidence shows, and are then taken back. It is a sort of junketing trip and nothing else. If we want to do something for the benefit of the National Guard, if we want to give them instruction from the regular officers of the United States Army, then let us appropriate money for that purpose, but do not appropriate it for the purpose of carrying troops from one end of the country to the other to participate in three or four days' maneuvers, which at the best do not bring about much benefit. It would be much better spent, as is suggested, in teaching them marksmanship instead of in these maneuvers. The maneuvers held in Virginia three or four years ago, for instance, were a perfect farce. They overran the country. They learned nothing, and it was a sort of dress parade in which the officers had a good time, but which resulted in no benefit whatever to the men. So, Mr. Chairman, I hope that the committee will vote for the motion which I have made to strike out this extravagant appropriation, which, in my judgment, would be of no benefit to the National Guard of the country generally.

Mr. PARKER. Mr. Chairman, I had not intended to speak upon this subject. I ask for ten minutes.

Mr. HULL. I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from New Jersey may have ten minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Iowa asks that the gentleman from New Jersey be allowed to proceed for ten minutes. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. PARKER. Mr. Chairman, I had not intended to speak, because I could not believe that it was earnestly proposed to abolish the system of summer encampments for the militia and the Regular Army together that has been such a grand success of these last years. As to the amount, \$1,000,000 is what it costs on an average, counting all expenses, to support a single

regiment of 1,000 men, while this million dollars goes to the benefit of the hundred thousand men of the whole National Guard of the whole United States. It also goes to the benefit of the Regular Army, because it brings them where they have never before been put, in actual, earnest, sympathetic touch with the officers and men of the National Guard. That touch between the Regular and Volunteer Army, that sympathy, is something that has been sought for since the beginning of our Government, and only now is beginning to be attained.

The statement that these encampments are dress parades must be founded on some misapprehension. I was at one camp last summer to see how it was conducted. I found there four or five thousand regular troops and the same number of militia. The regular troops stayed for two months, while the militia came for a week at a time, not counting the time occupied in travel. It took nine or ten days to include that. They stayed in camp a whole week, and every day of the week was engrossed with duties that were not of parade. There was not a single dress parade during the whole week that the troops were there from my State. It was fully taken up with marching, camping, putting up their own tents, taking them down, with scouting duty, with sham battles, and with an amount of work that was such that the Regular Army at the end of that time was tired out, though that work was only such as trained soldiers ought to have. Our soldiers ought to avoid the garrison dry rot which has destroyed so many armies, where the officers live in quarters and the men live in the barracks, by bringing them together in actual service, in the actual work and duty of the tented field and in camp where the captain's tent is at the head of every company street. Men in that way get to know their officers and trust in them, and officers learn to know their men.

This work now being done can not be done in any State camp, for, so far as I know, there is no State camp in the United States that affords room for the maneuvers of a brigade, much less for an actual sham battle. That was true of the first camp at West Point, but now we have secured grounds of ample size. At Mount Gretna the ground marched over was 10 miles long and 3 or 4 miles wide, with enough room for ordinary maneuvers. They had large maneuvers at Gettysburg, if they were hard on the men, and they taught our men the value of marching and that it must be able not only to shoot and obey orders, but to get there. At Fort Riley, in Kansas, we have a large reservation, and in other States there are others. What is needed for the training of brigades, when artillery shoots 5 or 6 miles and rifles carry a mile, is ground enough to march the men from place to place to find out the possibilities for cover under which men can get within the range of the modern rifle and the modern gun and to teach the soldiers the whole business of scouting and taking care of themselves in the field. We can give life to an army only by bringing it together in such larger bodies as are used in actual war and by giving that sympathy between the regular forces and the militia which we must have if we ever get into a real war. By these summer maneuvers we give, as far as may be, that training to the citizen soldier upon whom in the end we must rely. Mr. Chairman, I hope this amendment will not be adopted. [Applause.]

Mr. MANN. Mr. Chairman, the gentleman from Iowa referred to the damages that were paid in such a way that would leave one to infer that they were damages caused by irresponsible people for which the Government would not necessarily be legally liable. Now, the fact is that at West Point, Ky., the Government Army officers entered into contracts with the people there, whose land was to be used, providing in the contract for payment of the damage not only to the crops, but to all the fences and other things which might be damaged, and providing for the appointment of a board of Army officers. That board of Army officers was appointed. They considered all the claims. The amount of the original claims was \$21,635. The Army board allowed \$2,837.24. I do not know how much had been appropriated by Congress for this encampment, but although this award was allowed some years ago, not a dollar has been paid, and if it is the policy of the War Department to enter into contracts of this sort on these encampments of the State militia, to go in and damage property, ruin the crops of the people who happen to own the land there, and then content themselves merely with appointing a powerless board and paying no money, we better stop the encampment entirely.

Mr. HULL. Mr. Chairman, I would say that, in my judgment, they ought never to allow the expense or damage to exceed the amount appropriated for the encampment. They evidently have done that in this case, and it now becomes a claim. The Committee on Military Affairs has no jurisdiction over claims at all, and I paid no attention to that.

Mr. MANN. I understand that. I am not criticising the judgment of the gentleman in charge of the bill.



Mr. HULL. I reiterate what I said before—that in pursuance of law they hold these encampments, and as a result of encampments the citizen is damaged, through no fault of his own, in property, and it is the duty of the Government to pay the claim, whether it comes before the Committee on Claims or where it may come.

Mr. MANN. We all know what the result of sending a bill to the Committee on Claims is. These amounts are small to begin with. Possibly they might have sustained a claim in the Court of Claims, but if the War Department, when we make an appropriation as is proposed here of a million dollars, proceeds to walk into a man's field and ruin his wheat crop and then say to him, "Oh, you can file a claim, if you want to, against the Government"—if that is to be the policy I think we had better stop the encampments. That was the policy in this case. Congress made an appropriation for this encampment. The encampment was held.

Mr. HULL. I think that was the first encampment.

Mr. MANN. They entered into contracts for the use of the land upon which to hold the encampment, making the agreement to pay the money, and thereupon expended the money for I don't know what—gold or gilt, I suppose—not keeping back enough to pay these claims, not even a sum of less than \$3,000.

Mr. HULL. Right there I think the gentleman is referring to the first encampment ever authorized. There has been none of this trouble, I understand, since the first encampment. That is not justifying, however, the fact that any such thing ever happened, but I think that has not happened in the last two encampments.

Mr. FOSTER of Vermont. Mr. Chairman, I would like to ask the gentleman from Illinois if, upon his own statement, this is not one of those just claims he described the other day, when we had some of the war claims under consideration, where it is perfectly easy for a creditor of the Government to get a judgment against the United States and then collect his judgment?

Mr. MANN. It is perfectly easy, I may say to my distinguished friend, for a man to get a judgment against the United States Government and collect, but it happens in this case that there are a number of claimants—194, I am informed—having a total amount due them of less than \$3,000. It may be the gentleman's idea of justice, but not mine, that those men should be required to sue in the district court of Kentucky. I think that the War Department, to which is given the money to carry on these encampments, ought to pay these bills. These men could collect their claims through the district court of Kentucky, on a certification to the Congress of the United States, but that is a denial of justice for which the Department is responsible.

Mr. FOSTER of Vermont. I only call attention to this fact because I understood the other day that the gentleman was urging most strenuously that Congress ought not to consider these bills where a creditor could resort to a court and get his judgment and collect his judgment as he could against a private citizen. I understood the gentleman from Illinois is advocating that policy on the part of Congress, and while I do not believe in that position—

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. MANN. I ask unanimous consent for one minute more.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Illinois asks unanimous consent to proceed for one minute. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. MANN. Mr. Chairman, the gentleman understood me correctly. I do not believe it ought to be the policy of Congress to waste time over paying 5-cent claims, but I believe Congress ought to provide by law so that the War Department, when it enters upon duties which involve the payment of these claims and it has money provided for that purpose, will be compelled to use the money for that purpose, and not expend it for anything else, and then put Congress to the trouble of considering these claims. It is an outrage upon those people, for which somebody is to blame and for which we are not to blame.

Mr. FOSTER of Vermont. Mr. Chairman, I agree with the gentleman fully, and I hope hereafter when we have other claims coming before the House he will look at it in the same way.

Mr. MANN. I do not know whether I would favor the payment of this as a claim or not. I make no promises on this account, I will say to the gentleman.

Mr. FOSTER of Vermont. No; you will raise an objection when it comes up.

Mr. MANN. Well, I have not to any bill of the gentleman. I may have that opportunity some time—

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. GROSVENOR. Mr. Chairman, I have no objection to the appropriation of a million dollars for the training and support and all that of the militia of the States if it were not coupled with this provision that it is to be expended by the War De-

partment in supporting these joint brigade and division encampments at which the Regular Army and the militia will cooperate. I believe that that is money absolutely thrown away, and I believe it is a great deal worse than that. I have not witnessed a great many of these performances and I hope I may never witness another one. I saw one. One of them was brought into the neighborhood of the town in which I live and located about a mile outside of it. Regular batteries were transported from Fort Sheridan and cavalry from every direction, and infantry of the Regular Army were brought down there into that locality, and then there was brought from various sections of the State militia regiments, and they went through some sort of a performance there for two or three days. Among the rest they had a sham battle, and among the rest they undertook to maneuver on a large scale, as an army would maneuver. Well, I served four years and upward in the Army at a time of active service in war and, with a single exception, I never saw any regiment, brigade, division, battery, or squadron ever maneuver either in camp or in battle upon any of the magnificent plans and details that they undertook to perform down there, and they might just as well had a show and a performance on a slack rope and exhibitions of equestrianism for the benefit of a militia of Ohio as to have the performance they had, so far as benefiting the State troops went. In the first place, it may be useful for the Regular Army. Let them have their encampments and whatever is necessary. I do not propose to dictate, but I say this, the militia of the States is organized for quite another purpose. We all understand that. We are not training soldiers for war purposes in the militia of the States. Ulterior benefit may be found in case of war. If we have a war soon we may get a great deal of benefit out of the young men now in the State guard, but primarily they are organized for purposes of protection of the people of the States, as a posse comitatus, armed to support the civil authorities, and in the meantime, as I have said, the ulterior benefit may come in case of war. But this is my point, to handle these troops in the form of a brigade movement, division movement, sham battles, is absurd, so far as the State militia is concerned. Then there is another thing. I do not know what other people's experience has been, but the experience at the town where I live was such that we never want to see any Regular Army conglomerate performance such as that was ever come near us again.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. GROSVENOR. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent for five minutes more.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Ohio asks unanimous consent that his time may be extended for five minutes. Is there objection? [After a pause.] The Chair hears none.

Mr. GROSVENOR. Mr. Chairman, I am speaking under a great deal of difficulty, for I am not feeling at all like speaking now, but I had come to this point. I am going to tell you now what happened at that encampment. I never would have said a word about it if it had not been brought out in the records of the country in the affair that is going on in the Senate. There is always an irritation and conflict between these farmers' sons and merchants' clerks and men of the Regular Army in these encampments. Some trouble happened in the town of Athens, and a soldier of the regular battery was arrested for being drunk and disorderly on the street and locked up. Some time during the afternoon a soldier of his battery came up and located him in jail. That night somewhere from fifty to seventy-five members of the battery slipped one by one out of the camp, organized themselves into a small force, marched up into the town, marched up to the jail, and just about the time they were about to attack the jail, probably—as seems likely from the facts—a guard of infantry of the State Guard, commanded by a young man—a sergeant or corporal—named Clark, ordered them to halt, and from ten to seventy-five shots were fired instantly and young Clark fell dead on the street. Three others were wounded, and a citizen was wounded, and the bullets flew in every direction, breaking windows and firing into houses. And, incidentally, this whole force scattered and fled.

I do not care to go further. There never was a man punished for anything connected with it—I mean the shooting of Clark and others. There never was an officer of this battery called on to make a report, so far as appears to the public; there never was any report made by the captain and other commanding officers of that regular battery, and the feeble attempt of the local authorities to punish the men who committed that cold-blooded murder was utterly futile, for reasons that I do not care to go into just at this time under the surrounding circumstances. The young prosecuting attorney, J. M. Foster, esq., did his duty, but, for reasons I will not now state, failed. One man was convicted of an assault with intent to kill, for an assault he had made at a distance from where the murder was



committed, and that whole encampment was filled with factions and bitterness and troubles of that character, growing up almost necessarily between the Regular Army soldiers and the men of the Ohio State Guard.

So I may be prejudiced by what I witnessed, the horrors of that occasion, and the utter inability of the State authorities to successfully ascertain who the murderers were. I could go a great deal further and show you a great deal more about this, show how little aid we had, how a great deal of trouble was thrown in our way, show the factional conditions between those regular soldiers, including their officers and including the War Department here, who took up the cudgel in opposition to the authorities, and in opposition to the militia of the State.

They ought not to be put together. There is absolutely nothing in it. And let me summarize why. Drill the Regular Army as much as you please, and maneuver it as much as you please. These long marches and these maneuvers are in no wise incident or beneficial to the militia of a State.

Mr. CRUMPACKER. Will the gentleman answer a question?

Mr. GROSVENOR. Certainly.

Mr. CRUMPACKER. Were there any colored soldiers at that encampment?

Mr. GROSVENOR. Not one.

[Cries of "Vote."]

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on agreeing to the amendment offered by the gentleman from Virginia [Mr. HAY].

Mr. HEPBURN. Mr. Chairman, I would like to ask the chairman of the Committee on Military Affairs if he will give the committee the benefit of his opinion as to the comparative value of this appropriation for target practice of \$1,300,000, and the appropriation of a million of dollars for militia maneuvers?

Mr. HULL. Well, Mr. Chairman, I regard the appropriation for target practice as of higher importance than any other appropriation to increase the efficiency of the Army.

Mr. HEPBURN. Is there any such relation between the value of those two endeavors as would be indicated by the appropriation of a million and a million three hundred thousand dollars? Is not the target practice of infinitely greater advantage?

Mr. HULL. Oh, I think so.

Mr. HEPBURN. Then, why is it that the committee appropriates in that proportion?

Mr. HULL. Mr. Chairman, it would be impossible to appropriate for target practice any reasonable amount that would aggregate the sum that must be appropriated for maneuvers. We have now largely increased the appropriation for target ranges, and have furnished an incentive in the Regular Army, especially, for target practice by increasing the pay per month, and the pay has increased to those who have qualified as marksmen, expert marksmen, and sharpshooters. All enlisted men in the Army may so qualify. But I see no way by which we could appropriate the sum of a million dollars for improving marksmanship without distributing it to increase the efficiency in target work by giving to each man, as he won his standing by his skill. It may go over a million or fall far short.

Mr. HEPBURN. Mr. Chairman, for myself I look upon this appropriation of a million dollars for encampment of the militia and for maneuvers of the militia as an absolute waste of money. The militia, as a rule, are not the volunteers who in time of war augment the Army. For example, the gentleman from Iowa will remember that nine years ago when his own State was called upon for regiments of volunteers, we had then four what I might call "skeleton" regiments. They aggregated about 400 men to a regiment. They were already officered. When we came to the enlistment of those men, or, rather, the mustering in of those men to the service of the United States, a very large percentage of them were rejected.

Mr. HULL. I think about 15 per cent only were taken.

Mr. HEPBURN. I had thought 30. I have seen a statement somewhere that 70 per cent were rejected. See what a skeleton remained. Yet there was a complete skeleton. It was difficult to fill up those regiments to the maximum, and a long time, the gentleman will remember, was consumed while we were trying to get them, and when the regiments were finally formed and mustered into the service they were new men. They were not the men who might perhaps have participated in these encampments or others. They were a detriment, the small number that constituted this regiment. If the Government had made a call for a complete regiment of volunteers, officers to be appointed with the formation of the regiment, there would have been men interested in securing enlistments; but the officers were already appointed, and there was no incentive of that kind, and on that account, and on that account alone, I say it was a detriment. I do not believe that these maneuvers would be beneficial even if these same men—

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. HEPBURN. I should like to have about five minutes more.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Iowa asks that he have five minutes more time. Is there objection? [After a pause.] The Chair hears none.

Mr. HEPBURN. If the same men that had participated in the encampment had gone into the service, I think that this expenditure would still have been, in large part, a waste. Infinite time is consumed by a regiment in tactical movements. Months and months are expended in that way, and yet there is not a gentleman in the sound of my voice who does not know that on any occasion of real service of a regiment they could not use probably more than half a dozen movements during the course of a battle. A change from column to line and from line to column, an oblique movement, a partial wheel, the deployment into skirmish line—that would cover every movement that would probably be made by a regiment. Half a dozen movements would cover them all; and yet we spent hours and days and weeks and months in tactics and scarcely a moment in preparing men for the real business, namely, to shoot with accuracy.

I was a member of a regiment for over three years. I never saw target practice by that regiment; and yet months were expended in fitting ourselves for dress-parade movements that in actual service never were undertaken.

Gentlemen in the discussion of yesterday and this morning of the battle at New Orleans remind me of an incident I have somewhere read concerning those troops that wrought such havoc upon the British. The men in the front rank, according to this statement, fired three volleys and the men in the rear rank fired two volleys, yet there were results obtained equal to the whole number of these soldiers, showing that a result was secured for each two and a half shots. These men were marksmen. They had had target practice of immense benefit to them. They were efficient. And that is what we want with our Regular Army—to make them efficient. Ten thousand such men as were at the battle of New Orleans, composing Coffee's brigade, are worth more than the whole Regular Army when it comes to the use of the musket. Ten thousand men that could produce such results as these are worth more than 100,000 men that waste cartridges as cartridges are wasted. During the Mexican war we expended 70 cartridges to produce a result, and in those times they used buck and ball cartridges, having nine missiles in each cartridge. At the battle of Murfreesboro 119 cartridges were expended to produce a result. I was told by an officer who was present at the battles around Santiago that, in his judgment, more than 500 cartridges were expended to produce a result. How much more efficient would one-twentieth part of these men have been had they been skilled as were the men that composed the army of Jackson.

Therefore it seems to me that the one expenditure that we ought to be most willing to make and most zealous to have properly used is that for target practice. If you intend to make an army that will be efficient, you can not accomplish much in results by expending this money on the militia, because you have no certainty that the men whom you have thus educated will serve in time of war. But it is not so with the Regular Army. Every man in it ought to be made efficient with his musket. It does not matter, if he is so efficient, whether he can perform the fanciful Fourth of July evolutions or not. You want him capable of performing half a dozen of these movements; but you want him to be able to march and march with celerity. It was the rapidity of movements that was made possible by the drill in marching that made Jackson's army so formidable; their ability to move; their knowledge of logistics; their ability to use that knowledge in actual marches by night or day. It made them efficient. When you have our Army in such a condition that it can march, in such a condition that it can shoot with accuracy, it shows that there has been discipline, and it becomes a terror to its enemies. [Loud applause.]

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on agreeing to the amendment offered by the gentleman from Virginia [Mr. HAY], striking out the paragraph.

The question being taken, on a division (demanded by Mr. HAY), there were—ayes 27, noes 50.

Accordingly the amendment was rejected.

Mr. SMITH of Kentucky. Mr. Chairman, I offer the amendment which I send to the Clerk's desk.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Kentucky offers the following amendment, which the Clerk will report.

The Clerk read as follows:

Insert the following as a new paragraph:

"For paying claims for damages incident to the Army maneuvers at West Point, Ky., in the year 1903, the sum of \$2,837.24, to be immediately available."



Mr. HULL. I reserve the point of order against that. My understanding from the gentleman from Illinois was that the board of Army officers reported about \$3,000.

Mr. SMITH of Kentucky. They reported the exact amount in this amendment—\$2,837.24.

Mr. HULL. I understood the amendment to read \$28,000.

Mr. SMITH of Kentucky. Oh, no; \$2,800.

Mr. HULL. Then I will not make the point of order.

Mr. MILLER. Mr. Chairman, I want to inquire of the gentleman if this matter has not been before the Committee on Claims of this House and reported favorably to the House?

Mr. SMITH of Kentucky. Yes; a bill for the payment of these claims was introduced by myself in the first session of this Congress, referred to the Committee on Claims, and, I believe, on March 26 last year the Committee on Claims reported the bill for the payment of these claims, and it is now on the Calendar.

Mr. MILLER. Is the amount that is included in the amendment the same amount as that reported by the Committee on Claims?

Mr. SMITH of Kentucky. Taken from that report, just exactly the same amount.

Mr. HULL. Mr. Chairman, I want to move an amendment, provided that the sum mentioned shall be paid out of this appropriation.

Mr. SMITH of Kentucky. That is perfectly satisfactory to me.

Mr. HULL. I want to reduce the appropriation by this amount and keep these claims all paid up out of what we give the militia.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Iowa will furnish the Clerk with the amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

*Provided, That the sum of \$2,837.24 of the appropriation for the militia herein shall be expended in paying claims for maneuvers at West Point, Ky., in the year 1903.*

Mr. PERKINS. I wish to reserve a point of order to the amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman is too late in making his point of order against the amendment offered by the gentleman from Kentucky.

Mr. PERKINS. I wish to reserve a point of order against the amendment offered by the gentleman from Iowa [Mr. HULL].

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman may reserve a point of order against that.

Mr. PERKINS. I should like an explanation of the nature of this appropriation. Upon what theory is it that the Government is to be made responsible for damages caused by these encampments of militia? It seems to me this opens up a fertile field for future claims.

Mr. SMITH of Kentucky. Mr. Chairman, in answer to the gentleman's question I want to say that the land upon which the whole of these maneuvers were held was secured by the War Department, through its proper officers, and in the lease they provided that in addition to 5 cents an acre rent for the land they would pay such damages as might be done to the growing crops, fences, and other improvements by the soldiers during the maneuvers, and that these damages should be ascertained by a board of Army officers and reported to the War Department. They were so ascertained by a board of Army officers. The claims filed amounted to about \$21,000, but the Army board scaled them down to \$2,837.24, and the Secretary of War at every session of Congress since that report was made has recommended the payment of these claims.

Mr. PERKINS. Why was it necessary for the gentleman to go to the Committee on Claims, if this is based upon a contract made with the Government?

Mr. SMITH of Kentucky. There were 194 claims, ranging from 50 cents to \$5 or \$6 apiece. The gentleman from New York can well understand that no one claimant could afford to go into the Court of Claims on a sum of that size. It would be ridiculous to think of sending 194 claimants into the Court of Claims on little sums from 50 cents or \$1.50, and so on, until the largest one, perhaps not amounting to more than \$5 or \$6. The Committee on Claims, to whom the bill was referred, reported it unanimously last March.

Mr. PERKINS. How is the money to be paid?

Mr. SMITH of Kentucky. To the various claimants by the Secretary of War.

Mr. PERKINS. Why was this not a proper item for the Committee on Military Affairs in the beginning?

Mr. SMITH of Kentucky. I do not know, but I understand that the Committee on Military Affairs, as the chairman has stated on the floor of the House, had no jurisdiction of this

subject, and hence the bill was introduced for the payment of these claims, and was referred to the Committee on Claims, of which the gentleman from Kansas [Mr. MILLER] is chairman. That committee, as far back as last March, unanimously reported a bill, and it is now on the Calendar.

Mr. PERKINS. Were these damages occasioned by men in the Regular Army or by militia?

Mr. SMITH of Kentucky. Both, as I understand; they were regulars and militia together.

Mr. PERKINS. Damages done by marching over the fields?

Mr. SMITH of Kentucky. They were all under the command of United States officers.

Mr. MANN. The claims, as shown by the report of Army officers, were not for wanton destruction of property, but were for claims contemplated by the original contract.

Mr. PERKINS. Damages caused by the men marching over the ground?

Mr. MANN. Soldiers marching over the growing fields, and such as that.

Mr. PERKINS. Any claims for the destruction of buildings?

Mr. TAWNEY. No destruction of buildings, but destruction of fences and things of that kind.

Mr. MANN. It was the necessary destruction that would occur in any encampment, and they ought to have been paid out of the original appropriation; but I suppose that was exhausted in the maneuvers without saving any portion of it, as should have been done.

Mr. PERKINS. In view of the statements, Mr. Chairman, I withdraw the point of order.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Iowa to the amendment offered by the gentleman from Kentucky.

Mr. OLMSTED. Mr. Chairman, I would like to ask the gentleman from Iowa if he does not think his amendment should be a little more specific?

Mr. HULL. I have no objection to making it as specific as necessary, if the gentleman from Pennsylvania will indicate it.

Mr. OLMSTED. It did not seem to me to state the character of the claims, as I heard it read.

Mr. HULL. Mr. Chairman, I ask that the proviso be read again.

The CHAIRMAN. Without objection, the Clerk will read it. There was no objection, and the Clerk again read the amendment offered by Mr. HULL.

Mr. MANN. Mr. Chairman, I suggest that there be added the words "claims allowed by the board of officers convened by Special Order No. 162, Headquarters Department of the Lakes, September 6, 1903."

Mr. OLMSTED. That covers my objection.

Mr. HULL. I followed the language of the amendment of the gentleman from Kentucky and inserted it in the proviso.

The CHAIRMAN. Without objection, the amendment proposed by the gentleman from Iowa will be modified as suggested by the gentleman from Illinois. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

The CHAIRMAN. The question now is on agreeing to the amendment as modified offered by the gentleman from Iowa to the amendment of the gentleman from Kentucky.

The amendment to the amendment was agreed to.

The CHAIRMAN. The question now is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Kentucky as amended.

The question was taken; and the amendment as amended was agreed to.

The Clerk read as follows:

#### SUBSISTENCE DEPARTMENT.

Purchase of subsistence supplies: For issue, as rations to troops, to civil employees when entitled thereto, hospital matrons and nurses, general prisoners of war (including Indians held by the Army as prisoners, but for whose subsistence appropriation is not otherwise made), to military prisoners at posts: *Provided, That hereafter the emergency ration prescribed for use on emergent occasions shall, when issued, be furnished in addition to the regular ration under such regulations as may be prescribed by the Secretary of War, and for sales to officers and enlisted men of the Army; for authorized issues of candles; of toilet articles, barbers' laundry, and tailors' materials; for use of general prisoners confined at military posts without pay or allowances, and recruits, including applicants for enlistment while held under observation at recruiting stations; of matches for lighting public fires and lights at posts and stations and in the field; of flour used for paste in target practice; of salt and vinegar for public animals; of issues to Indians employed with the Army, without pay, as guides and scouts, and for toilet paper for use by enlisted men at posts, camps, rendezvous, and offices where water-closets are provided with sewer connections, or where the sanitary conditions require its use. For payments: For meals for recruiting parties and recruits, including applicants for enlistment while held under observation; for hot coffee, canned meats, and baked beans for troops traveling, when it is impracticable to cook their rations; for coffee roasters, for cooking apparatus in the field and when traveling (except on transports), bake ovens and apparatus pertaining thereto; scales, weights, measures, utensils, tools, stationery, blank books and forms,*

printing, advertising, commercial newspapers, use of telephones, office furniture, commissary chests and outfits, and field desks of commissaries; for temporary buildings, cellars, and other means of protecting subsistence supplies (when not provided by the Quartermaster's Department): *Provided further*, That hereafter the Secretary of War may cause to be sold at public sale, in Cuba or the Philippine Islands, under regulations to be prescribed by him, such subsistence stores in good condition, intended for issue or for sales to officers and enlisted men, as may from time to time accumulate at any subsistence depot, military post, or in the field, in excess of amounts required for use and which can not, with economy and advantage, be shipped to other subsistence depots, posts, or places for military use, the proceeds to be immediately available for general disbursement, under the appropriation for subsistence of the Army current at the time of sale for any of the objects contemplated by that appropriation; for extra pay to enlisted men employed on extra duty in the Subsistence Department for periods of not less than ten days, at rates fixed by law; for compensation of civilians employed in the Subsistence Department, and for other necessary expenses incident to the purchase, testing, care, preservation, issue, sale, and accounting for subsistence supplies for the Army; for payment of commutation of rations to the cadets at the United States Military Academy in lieu of the regular established ration at the rate of 30 cents per ration; and for the payment of the regulation allowances of commutation in lieu of rations to enlisted men on furlough; to ordnance sergeants on duty at ungarisoned posts; to enlisted men and male and female nurses when stationed at places where rations in kind can not be economically issued, and when traveling on detached duty where it is impracticable to carry rations of any kind; to enlisted men selected to go to contest for places or prizes in department and Army rifle competition while traveling to and from places of contest; to male and female nurses on leaves of absence; to applicants for enlistment while traveling under orders; for payment of commutation of rations in lieu of the regular established ration for members of the Nurse Corps (female) while on duty in hospital, and for enlisted men applicants for enlistment held under observation and general prisoners sick therein, at the rate of 30 cents per ration (except that at the general hospital at Fort Bayard, N. Mex., 50 cents per ration is authorized for enlisted patients in said hospital), to be paid to the surgeon in charge: *Provided further*, That hereafter officers entrusted with the disbursement of funds for the subsistence of the Army are hereby authorized to keep, at their own risk, in their personal possession for disbursement, such restricted amounts of subsistence funds for facilitating payments of small amounts to public creditors as shall from time to time be authorized by the Secretary of War; for subsistence of the masters, officers, crews, and employees of the vessels of the Army transport service; for ice to organizations of enlisted men stationed at such places as the Secretary of War may determine; for providing prizes to be established by the Secretary of War for enlisted men of the Army who graduate from the Army schools for bakers and cooks, the total amount of such prizes at the various schools not to exceed \$900 per annum; in all, \$6,499,984.50, to be expended under the direction of the Secretary of War, and accounted for as "Subsistence of the Army," and for that purpose to constitute one fund.

Mr. TAWNEY. Mr. Chairman, I want to reserve a point of order to certain new matter contained in this paragraph. I desire to ask at this time whether it is necessary to reserve the point of order against the entire paragraph in order to reach the new provisions?

The CHAIRMAN. No; the gentleman can reserve it against any portion of the paragraph.

Mr. TAWNEY. There are two provisos that I want to reserve points of order against. On page 20, beginning with the word "Provided," on line 18, and continuing over on page 21 to the word "appropriation," line 6; and on page 22, beginning with the word "Provided," on line 8, down to and including the word "war," line 14. These are new provisions, I think, and there is some information I desire of the chairman.

Mr. MANN. Mr. Chairman, in addition I desire to reserve the point of order for the present to the expression in the paragraph which occurs several times, "applicants for enlistment while held under observation."

The CHAIRMAN. Will the gentleman point out where that expression occurs.

Mr. MANN. On line 22, page 19, is one place, "including applicants for enlistment while held under observation." On page 21, line 25, "applicants for enlistment while traveling under orders," and on page 22, lines 3 and 4, "applicants for enlistment while held under observation."

Mr. HULL. Mr. Chairman, there are several changes here:

*Provided*, That hereafter the emergency ration prescribed for use on emergency occasions shall, when issued, be furnished in addition to the regular ration under such regulations as may be prescribed by the Secretary of War—

Mr. MANN. There is no point of order made on that.

Mr. HULL. Then, to the phrase, "including applicants for enlistment while held under observation," I understand the gentleman from Illinois reserves the point of order.

Mr. MANN. Yes. I would like to ask the gentleman a question.

Mr. HULL. Under the previous regulations of the Department a man, for instance, at Des Moines enlisting in the Army was immediately examined and sworn in. That has been changed so that he simply proposes to enlist, passes a preliminary examination, but is not mustered into the service until he goes to a camp of concentration of all recruits, where he is carefully examined by a Regular Army officer. During this period he is held under observation.

Mr. MANN. It used to be the custom, as I understand, to have these applicants examined by the surgeon at the recruiting station.

Mr. HULL. In the locality.

Mr. MANN. And now it is proposed to have the applicant examined by the recruiting officer and then sent to the general concentration camp?

Mr. HULL. He may have an examination by a local doctor, but he is not mustered in, and under the present law there is no way to feed him and pay him.

Mr. MANN. And that is the reason for this?

Mr. HULL. Yes.

Mr. MANN. That is perfectly satisfactory, and I will withdraw the point of order on that.

Mr. TAWNEY. Now, Mr. Chairman, before the gentleman from Iowa proceeds, I will point out to him what my objection to this paragraph is. It is not so much against the condemnation and sale.

Mr. HULL. This is for sale without condemnation.

Mr. TAWNEY. Yes; this is for sale without condemnation, at a price to be fixed by the commanding officer. The objection I have to this—and I think the gentleman will agree with me that it might lead to very dangerous practices—is that the proceeds derived from the sale of these supplies goes back into the Treasury and is credited to the appropriation for subsistence. It may be that that opens the way for the officer whose duty it is to purchase supplies to purchase more than may be needed at a given post for the purpose of aiding the officers at that post in securing, when these extra supplies are sold, supplies which they need, at a cost very much below what the Government paid, and then turning the money into the Treasury. The officer who is responsible for the administration of the appropriation loses nothing whatever. This money goes right back again to the credit of the appropriation. I would have no objection if the gentleman would accept an amendment, on line 3, page 21, after the words "to be," whereby all after that is stricken out and then substitute the words "paid into the Treasury of the United States." Then there would be no inducement on the part of the officer to buy for sale.

Mr. MANN. That would be reenacting the existing law.

Mr. TAWNEY. If that is so, then the thing I am endeavoring to accomplish will be accomplished by striking out all after the words "to be," in line 3, after that proviso. If it is worded so that the proceeds of the sale of these supplies would go back into the Treasury and not go to the credit of the appropriation, then the officer whose duty it is to administer this appropriation would see that there were no extra purchases made, because to that extent his appropriation would be reduced, and I think it would tend to good administration and prevent abuses that might otherwise arise.

Mr. HULL. Mr. Chairman, the proposition submitted to the Committee on Military Affairs was to give the power to sell under certain conditions goods that had not been condemned at any post. The arguments that have been used by the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. TAWNEY] would be good if we had made it so broad as that. But we restricted it to Cuba and the Philippine Islands only, because to open it up for sale at all the different posts of this country would lead or might lead to very grave abuse.

Mr. TAWNEY. There is no doubt about that.

Mr. HULL. The only argument that can be given for it in Cuba and the Philippine Islands is the fact that, for instance, in Cuba we have quite a large army of occupation at the present time. The authorities properly keep a surplus of supplies on hand there. In the event of the army being ordered home the expense of transporting the subsistence supplies back to this country would be very considerable, and yet if you do not allow them to use this money for the purpose of purchasing other supplies in this country they would ship them back for the reason that they must have the rations if the army is kept to the number estimated for when this appropriation is submitted to us.

Mr. TAWNEY. They would have the power, assuming now that they have a larger quantity of relief supplies in Cuba than will be needed during temporary occupation and have a supply on hand when the Army moves back to the United States again—they would have the power, under this authority, under this provision, to sell the surplus, would they not?

Mr. HULL. Yes; if this stays in the bill.

Mr. TAWNEY. Now, if they were required to put the proceeds from the sale of that surplus stock back into the Treasury, if it depleted their appropriation to any extent so as to make it necessary for them to come in and ask for a deficiency, it would be such a deficiency, an emergency deficiency, as would be entirely legal; and would it not be better to require them to do that than to open the door for them, either in Cuba or the Phil-



ippine Islands, to thus attempt to either increase their appropriation or buy more than they really need in order that they may help some fellow out by selling him at a price below cost?

Mr. HULL. I can see no object in buying more than they need to send to Cuba. I can see an object in buying more than they really need if officers were at all dishonest and sending it to the frontier of this country, because the Government ration is worth the same everywhere to the Army. An officer of the Army pays the same in Alaska for supplies furnished by the Commissary Department as he does in New York. In other words, the freight that is added to this is not charged to the Army, but it is sold at the same price in Manila, Chicago, or in Alaska, and properly so, because if the officer had to carry the load of additional transportation it would destroy his ability to live in some parts of Alaska. He is not there on his own motion. He goes where the Government sends him, and he is put on an equality, so far as the expense is concerned and so far as the Government can, with every other man in the service. Now, I do not believe this provision ought to prevail at all as to any posts in the United States proper. I am not anxious for it to prevail anywhere, but yet, as I say it might be, as I illustrated in Cuba it would be, of actual benefit to the Government itself to give them the right to sell surplus stores rather than to retransport them back to this country. If they are condemned, they get the benefit of the condemnation. If they are good, they can not sell them at all. They can move them, though, and the Government pays the freight. They can move them from one end of the country to the other as demanded by the service.

Mr. TAWNEY. I would say to the gentleman—

Mr. HULL. Just one minute. If there is danger in the minds of Members of this being abused by officers selling to increase their appropriations it ought not to stay in at all. I do not believe in the danger.

Mr. TAWNEY. My attention was first attracted to this provision because in an examination of several appropriation bills, especially the sundry civil bill, I found that there is a growing tendency in the Departments and bureaus of the Government where they sell anything to have the proceeds of that sale turned back into the Treasury to the credit of their appropriations. They are utilizing official services employed in the production of certain articles which they are selling under the authority of law, and they are always trying to have the proceeds of such sales credited to their appropriations and thus increase their appropriation. To prevent this, I think they should be required to transfer the money to the Treasury of the United States. That would prevent any abuse.

Mr. HULL. My judgment is, if you make that requisition they will ship all stores back in order to avoid a deficiency. That would be my guess, and it is only a guess.

Mr. MANN. Is it not a fact your appropriation is always a good deal larger than the actual expenditure?

Mr. HULL. No; not on subsistence.

Mr. MANN. How much more did you appropriate last year than was expended?

Mr. HULL. This year has not been entirely used up yet, but the Commissary Department stated that it would be all used up before the close of the fiscal year.

Mr. MANN. You aim to make a larger appropriation and usually have done that?

Mr. HULL. There is sometimes a saving by the reduced cost in buying food, and sometimes there is a deficiency on account of the increased cost of food.

Mr. MANN. It has been charged in some of these places, possibly in the Philippines and sometimes in Cuba in the past, that the people enjoyed the benefit of purchasing Government supplies at a great profit to themselves and at considerable loss to the Government.

Mr. HULL. That was true in the Philippine Islands, where all parties connected with the insular government for one or two years had all the privileges of the commissary that were extended to officers of the Army. That has been taken away now, as I understand it, and should have been done, and that privilege never should have been extended.

Mr. MANN. Does the gentleman think there might be danger of that sort of thing if an officer can buy supplies, sell them, buy more supplies with the money, sell them, buy more supplies, and conduct a regular retail or wholesale business?

Mr. HULL. That would never happen at public sales. Where these abuses crept in happened at private sale by order of the Department. This is only for public sale, and it seems to me that the danger is exceedingly remote that an officer would order a sale of the commissary stores where the whole world knows what he is doing, and make an abuse of the privilege; but if there is danger of that in the mind of any man I shall

not oppose any proposition to strike it out on the point of order, but I think it is a good provision. I think it is an economical one. I think it is a beneficial provision, limited as we have it here, and not open to all the posts of the country, where a citizen may have influence with an officer to get things, but limited to those two tropical countries, one of which we hope to soon vacate and the other where the enlargement and contraction of the army makes sometimes a surplus.

Mr. MANN. When the gentleman says, "We all hope we will vacate one soon," he omits to have in mind a gentleman connected with another body at the other end of the Capitol.

Mr. HULL. Oh, well, I do not pretend to say we will get out.

Mr. MANN. Why not accept the proposition of the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. TAWNEY]?

Mr. HULL. I think you might as well strike it all out as to do that. That is the only reason.

Mr. MANN. That would leave authority to sell the supplies and not bring them home. That is what you want to do?

Mr. HULL. You reduce the appropriation by that amount.

Mr. MANN. They know they can get all the money they want.

Mr. HULL. They know they are always criticised when they bring in a deficiency bill.

Mr. MANN. But they know when they manage to bring in something they have saved in that way they get 100 per cent credit on it.

Mr. FITZGERALD. Will the gentleman yield for a question?

Mr. HULL. Certainly.

Mr. FITZGERALD. Suppose the Army in Cuba has some of these stores purchased with the funds of the Cuban Government?

Mr. HULL. Is not that a violent supposition?

Mr. FITZGERALD. No; it is not, because the evidence is that they are buying them now.

Mr. HULL. Then they would not belong to the Army of the United States. They would belong to the Cuban Government.

Mr. FITZGERALD. They do belong to the Army of the United States, although the cost of maintaining troops there is, to some extent at least, paid by the Cuban Government.

Mr. HULL. I am very glad to hear that, because I was of the impression that we were paying all of the bills for the support of the Army.

Mr. TAWNEY. In Cuba?

Mr. HULL. That is, of the Army.

Mr. FITZGERALD. The gentleman is entirely mistaken.

Mr. TAWNEY. All the expense the Government has incurred in the island of Cuba up to this time, except the expense of transporting the Army to Cuba, has been paid for out of the treasury of Cuba.

Mr. HULL. Does the gentleman say that all of the subsistence of the Army is paid for there?

Mr. TAWNEY. Yes, sir.

Mr. HULL. Then I can see no sense in this provision at all.

Mr. FITZGERALD. Not all of it is paid so far out of the Cuban treasury.

Mr. HULL. If they are not sending rations and subsistence there, as they report to us, accumulating a surplus, so that if the Army is kept there the subsistence will be there, and if they go away there will be a surplus, this should not be in at all.

Mr. TAWNEY. They are being paid for to some extent out of the treasury of Cuba. I have a letter in the committee room from the Secretary of War to that effect. He sent a detailed statement of everything paid, and I will send and get it.

Mr. HULL. I will say to the gentleman that in our hearing the commissary of subsistence stated that they had to keep a surplus of food there, because if they stayed there they would need it, but if they returned they would not, or if the Army were reduced they would not need it; and yet everyone knows we would not tolerate for a moment running so near the margin of daily supplies that it would endanger the feeding of our army.

Mr. FITZGERALD. I asked the gentleman the question for the reason that at present from the revenues of the Cuban Government sufficient funds are being diverted to maintain the Army there. I suppose that part of the maintenance of the Army is furnishing subsistence. Now, under this provision whatever stores remain there they could sell.

Mr. HULL. I think the gentleman is mistaken about subsistence, for this reason: I have never understood it was the intention of the Government to charge the Cuban Government with the cost of the Army, a cost that we would have been compelled to meet even if they had never gone there. For instance, they feed the Army the same rations as they do here. Now, do I understand the gentleman from New York [Mr. FITZGERALD] to say or the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. TAWNEY] to say

that the Government is now collecting from the Cuban Government the amount expended for subsistence of our Army there from day to day? If the gentleman states that, and can prove it, this appropriation should be cut down.

Mr. FITZGERALD. I did not say that.

Mr. HULL. And the "Cuban invasion," as some of the people call it, by our troops is really a great economical measure in the care of the Army, if that is the case.

Mr. FITZGERALD. That may be one good excuse, but I am not inquiring into that. The statement was made that the cost of maintaining the Army in Cuba was being met—

Mr. HULL. Does not that refer to extra expense, as that of charging up the extra mileage?

Mr. FITZGERALD. I am asking the gentleman for information.

Mr. HULL. I have not got it.

Mr. FITZGERALD. I am asking the gentleman for it.

Mr. HULL. You gentlemen on the Committee on Appropriations would have more knowledge of that than I.

Mr. TAWNEY. We have a detailed statement from the Secretary of War in regard to it. I have sent to the committee room for it.

Mr. FITZGERALD. I am asking this in order to be enlightened upon this provision.

Mr. HULL. I say to the gentleman now, and I think he will see it, that we pay the subsistence of the Army and pay proper of the soldiers, and there would be no more reason to charge the Cuban Government with the rations we issue to our soldiers because they are in Cuba than to charge them with the pay proper of the Army.

Mr. FITZGERALD. Have they the same rations issued there as here?

Mr. HULL. We have an alternative ration, costing about the same, that they can vary; but the character of the ration is practically that of the one issued here.

Mr. FITZGERALD. That would make a difference in the situation.

Mr. KEIFER. Mr. Chairman, I think the gentleman in charge of the bill has reached probably the true point, that we are not paying them anything but the additional cost of maintaining the Army in Cuba; that we buy the ration now just as we have always done, and if there is any additional cost on account of transportation or otherwise in maintaining our Army at the camp of Columbia, outside of Habana, then it is paid out of Cuban funds, by order of the Secretary of War by the governor down there. But there has been no information coming to me that the Army officers were paid or the men paid or their rations paid for out of any Cuban funds. I think the chairman of the Committee on Appropriations has a letter which will explain it all.

Mr. HULL. Mr. Chairman, I understand there is information before us of a deficiency for extra mileage that is to be paid by the Cuban Government, and extra cost of transportation of the Army and its supplies. There is a large deficiency made for that, as I understand, and mileage, and that is expected to be paid back out of the revenues of the Cuban Government; but the pay of the Army proper, for its clothing, subsistence, medical attendance, and all the expenses going on the same as they would go on in this country we are paying for.

Mr. MANN. Will the gentleman permit me to ask him one question?

Mr. HULL. Oh, certainly.

Mr. MANN. It was reported around the Capitol here some time ago—and if not true it ought to be denied—that the expenses of sending the American troops to Cuba were borne wholly or in part out of an original emergency appropriation made at the beginning of the Spanish-American war. Can the gentleman tell us whether that is the case or not?

Mr. HULL. We have no report upon that, and no other information than the gentleman has.

Mr. TAWNEY. The gentleman is mistaken. The fact is that it was not the emergency appropriation made at the beginning of the Spanish war. There was an appropriation, as I now recall it, about the close of the Spanish-American war, when the Philippine uprising began, of about \$3,000,000, and part of this extra expense, I understand, has been paid out of that \$3,000,000 appropriation. How Congress could make that appropriation for the Army and how it could be expended in view of the constitutional provision, I do not know, but it was made, and it has been made available for the payment of that expense.

Mr. MANN. I do not see how that money could be used in that way in view of the constitutional prohibition of such a use. The money could not be properly expended by the Government in that way.

Mr. HULL. It did not come from the Committee on Military Affairs, and members of that committee have no information.

Mr. MANN. I am not criticising where the appropriation came from. The appropriation was probably proper to be made, but the Constitution provides that they can not extend over two years.

Mr. HULL. That is not a question with which we have to do; the Comptroller and the courts can pass on that question.

Mr. MANN. If it be a fact that they are paying money for any purpose of that sort, which was not contemplated at the time the appropriation was made, even if they have the right to use the money legally, there would be a question, but in this case clearly they do not have the right to use the money, because Congress can not make an appropriation for military purposes in that way.

Mr. KEIFER. It is doing it all along. We will do it next year. Because we appropriate for fortifications that continue without any limitation to two years.

Mr. MANN. I suppose they can make an appropriation for fortifications, but that is not for the maintenance of the Army.

Mr. KEIFER. It is connected with the Army.

Mr. MANN. While it is connected with the Army, this is directly for the maintenance of the Army, and that it can not do under the Constitution.

Mr. HULL. The whole matter is with the Comptroller of the Treasury and the courts.

The CHAIRMAN. Does the gentleman insist on his point of order?

Mr. TAWNEY. I shall have to insist upon the point of order unless the gentleman accepts the proposed amendment.

Mr. HULL. Then it might just as well go out.

Mr. TAWNEY. Then I insist upon the point of order.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair sustains the point of order made by the gentleman from Minnesota.

Mr. TAWNEY. The other part, line 8 to line 14, on page 22, where it is proposed to give to officers intrusted with the disbursement of funds for the subsistence of the Army authority to keep, at their own risk, in their personal possession for disbursement, such restricted amounts—

The CHAIRMAN. Beginning with the word "Provided," in line 8, and extending down to the word "war," in line 14?

Mr. TAWNEY. Yes.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair understands. Now on page 20, beginning with the word "Provided," in line 18—

Mr. TAWNEY. Down to and including the word "appropriation," in line 6, on page 21.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair so understands. The Chair sustains the point of order.

Mr. HULL. What point of order does the Chair sustain?

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair sustains the point of order striking out those two provisos. Does the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. MANN] insist on his point of order.

Mr. MANN. No; I withdraw my point of order.

The CHAIRMAN. The point of order made by the gentleman from Illinois is withdrawn.

Mr. HULL. There is only one proviso that has been passed upon, which is the one on page 25 of the print which I have.

Mr. TAWNEY. On page 22 of the one which I have.

Mr. HULL. The one beginning—

*Provided*, That hereafter the Secretary of War may cause to be sold at public sale—

That has been sustained.

Mr. TAWNEY. Yes.

Mr. HULL. Now, I understand the other is simply reserved until you know whether you want it or not.

Mr. TAWNEY. Yes.

Mr. HULL. I understood the Chair to sustain that, too.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair has sustained the point of order made by the gentleman from Minnesota, directed, first, against the words beginning with "*Provided*," in line 18, page 20, down to and including the word "appropriation," in line 6, page 21; and under the ruling of the Chair that goes out. Also, the Chair has sustained the point of order directed against the words beginning with the word "*Provided*," in line 8, on page 22, down to and including the word "war," in line 14, on that page. That goes out also under the ruling.

Mr. TAWNEY. I simply reserved the point of order on the last proviso for the purpose of asking the gentleman from Iowa a question. I have not insisted upon that point of order.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair understood the gentleman to insist.

Mr. TAWNEY. I have not insisted on that point of order.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair will then modify his ruling as indicated.

Mr. TAWNEY. Under this paragraph authority is given to



officers intrusted with the disbursement of funds for the subsistence of the Army to keep at their own risk, in their personal possession, for disbursement, such restricted amounts of subsistence funds for facilitating payments of small amounts to public creditors as shall, from time to time, be authorized by the Secretary of War. I have no doubt about the convenience of this, but I want to submit to the gentleman from Iowa that the language is so general as to the amount that an officer may have at any one time that it is very likely to be abused, and if the gentleman could find more restricted language—

Mr. HULL. I should like to say to the gentleman from Minnesota that my understanding is that at places where they have no subtreasury officers have that power now. This only extends it to places where they have a subtreasury. I should like to call the attention of the gentleman from Minnesota, and the committee, to the statement of General Sharpe on this subject:

The CHAIRMAN. In regard to the provision about keeping funds on hand by officers at their personal risk, what is the practice now?

General SHARPE. Under section 3620 of the Revised Statutes the Secretary of the Treasury can authorize the Secretary of War to grant authority to officers stationed at places remote from a depository to keep at their own risk in their personal possession the subsistence funds required for disbursement, but in places where there is a treasurer or an assistant treasurer this authority can not be granted under the present law. The purpose of this proviso is to enable authority to be given in places where there is a treasurer or an assistant treasurer. If an enlisted man comes to an office after banking hours to be paid commutation of rations, he must be given a check, and that check he will have to cash at a saloon or some other place.

The CHAIRMAN. It gives the Secretary of War the right to make allowances in places where they have a subtreasury?

General SHARPE. Yes, sir. Those officers are under bond. There is no relaxation of the security to the Government. It places additional responsibility on the officer. In the Spanish war troops went through New York from Montauk Point, and it was urgent in that case; the officer had to violate the law or make himself liable to criticism.

If he had refused to pay them, he would have been subject to criticism, and in paying them he violated the law.

Mr. TAWNEY. And while this provision is new it is not establishing any new authority except at the point where there is a subtreasury or a treasury?

Mr. HULL. That is all.

Mr. TAWNEY. Mr. Chairman, I withdraw the point of order.

Mr. OLMSTED. Mr. Chairman, I offer the following amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

On line 1, page 20, strike out the words "vinegar for public animals."

Mr. OLMSTED. Mr. Chairman, this bill carries a total appropriation amounting to \$79,000,000 for purposes little understood by most of us. We have to take it upon credit and upon our confidence in the Military Committee. This particular paragraph covers about \$6,400,000. It bears some evidence of having been padded in the matter of language for the purpose of enumerating many items, stringing out long paragraphs of many items to justify an enormous total, but no amount is specified for any particular item.

Now, I notice, on page 19, "Matches for lighting public fires." I do not suppose there will ever be a box of matches bought for that particular purpose. I notice several other peculiar features in this paragraph to which I will not call specific attention, but this item of "vinegar for public animals" seems to require explanation. I have offered this amendment for the purpose of asking the chairman of the Military Committee three questions: First, what are public animals? Second, is vinegar a necessary article of diet for public animals? And third, what proportion of the amount of this \$6,400,000 is to be expended for the purchase of vinegar for public animals? [Laughter.]

Mr. HULL. Mr. Chairman, I suppose the gentleman from Pennsylvania, who is understood to be a distinguished farmer as well as a great lawyer—

Mr. OLMSTED. More farmer than lawyer.

Mr. HULL (continuing). Realizes that in many cases an application of hot vinegar is a good thing for spavin and sprain in horses, and that at some times it is excellent for the scalded back of a horse. Is not that so?

Mr. OLMSTED. I never have tried it.

Mr. HULL. Did the gentleman never ride a horse until his back became scalded?

Mr. OLMSTED. No; I am a good rider. I keep my balance and his back does not rub. [Laughter.]

Mr. HULL. Did not the gentleman ever drive a horse fast enough to cause a spavin?

Mr. OLMSTED. No; I never drove a spavined horse.

Mr. HULL. I am afraid the gentleman is no sport at all. [Laughter.] I have lost faith in the story that has been circulated around these halls that he is a distinguished agricul-

turist from Pennsylvania. [Laughter.] I should imagine that a very small amount of this appropriation would be expended for vinegar.

Mr. OLMSTED. Will the gentleman limit the appropriation to a hundred thousand dollars.

Mr. HULL. Oh, yes; \$20,000, I should say, would be sufficient, but let us have it in the debate, so that the War Department may have notice that they must not go beyond a certain sum for vinegar.

Mr. OLMSTED. I will modify my amendment by inserting after the word "animals," "Provided not more than \$20,000 of this amount shall be used for vinegar for public animals."

Mr. HULL. I am inclined to think that that is not subject to a point of order, as it is a limitation. It might be at a large expense, but of course the gentleman has no hope or desire of getting such a proviso adopted or he would not have offered it.

The question on agreeing to the amendment was taken, and the amendment was disagreed to.

Mr. TAWNEY. Mr. Chairman, there has been some discussion this afternoon in regard to our expenditures in connection with the occupation or intervention in Cuba, and I desire, for the information of the committee, to have read at the Clerk's desk a letter received from the Secretary of War.

Mr. HULL. Will the gentleman waive that until I have corrected some punctuation in the bill?

Mr. TAWNEY. Certainly.

Mr. HULL. Mr. Chairman, on page 19, line 18, after the word "war," I ask that a semicolon be inserted. In line 20, same page, after the word "material," strike out the semicolon and insert a comma.

The CHAIRMAN. Without objection, the amendments will be agreed to.

There was no objection.

Mr. HULL. On page 20, line 3, after the word "scouts," strike out the colon and insert a semicolon.

Mr. OLMSTED. Is that in the interest of economy?

Mr. HULL. That is in the interest of punctuation and to save amendments by the Senate.

The CHAIRMAN. Without objection, the amendment will be agreed to.

There was no objection.

Mr. HULL. On page 21, after the word "department," in line 9, strike out the comma and insert a semicolon.

The CHAIRMAN. Without objection, the amendment will be agreed to.

There was no objection.

Mr. TAWNEY. Mr. Chairman, there have been some questions asked this afternoon concerning our expenditures in Cuba and whether or not any part of that expenditure is being paid out of the treasury of the Cuban Government. During the consideration of the first emergency appropriation bill at this session, which carried an appropriation of, I think, \$150,000 for traveling pay of officers in the Army, the subject came up, and the Secretary of War addressed to the chairman of the Committee on Appropriations a letter completely covering this subject. In view of the discussion this afternoon, I ask unanimous consent that the letter may now be read for the information of the committee and printed in the RECORD.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Minnesota asks unanimous consent that the letter to which he has just referred may be read and printed in the RECORD. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

The Clerk read as follows:

WAR DEPARTMENT,  
Washington, December 14, 1906.

MY DEAR MR. TAWNEY: The cost to the United States for the unusual expenditures resulting from the sending of the army of pacification to Cuba amounted on November 30, 1906, to \$2,012,632.77, distributed as follows.

Quartermaster's Department:

Regular supplies	\$103,763.82
Incidental expenses	84,316.79
Barracks and quarters	22,252.61
Army transportation	1,321,361.81
Clothing and camp and garrison equipment	69,204.25
Horses for cavalry, artillery and engineers	32,500.00
Emergency fund	105,625.00

\$1,739,024.28

Pay Department	82,495.89
Signal Corps	66,616.81
Subsistence Department	49,041.56
Medical Department	57,235.15
Engineer Department	17,774.04
Ordnance Department	445.04

Total 2,012,632.77

In addition there will be a continued expense so long as this army remains there, of which an itemized account is being kept. As near

as can be estimated, this will be for the remainder of the current fiscal year as follows:

Quartermaster's Department, for the period Nov. 30, 1906, to June 30, 1907:	
Transportation of the Army and its supplies	\$403,503.98
Horses for cavalry, artillery, and engineers	10,000.00
Clothing and camp and garrison equipage	50,600.00
Incidental expenses	293,538.85
	\$757,642.83
Pay Department, \$45,831.05 per month, or for the period Nov. 30, 1906, to June 30, 1907	320,817.35
Signal Corps, for the period Nov. 30, 1906, to June 30, 1907	58,000.00
Subsistence Department, \$23,925.28 per month, or for period Nov. 30, 1906, to June 30, 1907	167,476.96
Medical Department, for the period Nov. 30, 1906, to June 30, 1907	14,000.00
Total	1,317,937.14

So far these expenditures have been made out of the regular appropriations, supplemented in the case of the Quartermaster's, the Signal Corps, and the Engineer Department out of the allotments made to them from the emergency fund of the War Department. Expenditures from such allotments, so far as reported, are as follows:

Quartermaster's Department	\$105,625
Signal Corps	50,000
Engineer Department	10,000
Total	165,625

In my current annual report I say:

"An insurrection against the Government of Cuba that arose during the past summer assumed such proportions by September that the President of that Republic requested the intervention of the United States, under the authority derived from the so-called 'Platt amendment'; and in connection with the establishment of a provisional government for Cuba for the purposes of pacification an expeditionary force of regular troops, aggregating 5,396 men, was dispatched to Cuba and is now there, with Brig. Gen. James F. Bell, Chief of Staff, in command.

"During our first military occupation of Cuba, and while the Army was employed in putting down the insurrection in the Philippines, a large part of the expense involved in such use of the United States Army was made a charge against the revenues of Cuba and the Philippines, respectively.

"Among the classes of army expenditures thus paid out of the Cuban and Philippine treasuries were the following:

"Rent of barracks, hospitals, storehouses, quarters for officers and for enlisted men entitled thereto by the regulations of the United States Army; rent of target ranges, pastures, drill grounds, and similar expenditures; repairs for quarters, and material used in such repairs; services, such as scavengers and policing not required to be performed by troops and prisoners; all expenses necessary in the supply of water; such expenditures as are made from the appropriation for transportation of the Army, as repairs of wagons, transportation material, shoeing of horses and mules, maintenance of vessels and crews used by the Quartermaster's Department in Cuba; surveying instruments and books; expenses connected with the establishment and maintenance of detention camps, material used in disinfection, and similar emergency expenditures; maintenance and operation of telephone and telegraph lines used by the Army; and hire of scouts, guides, and interpreters.

"The sending of an expeditionary force to Cuba of course involves a very considerable expenditure for army purposes additional to that which would be necessary if the same force were employed in their ordinary places of duty. An itemized account of such expenditures is being kept by the Department, and it seems just and proper that the increased cost to the United States of sending expeditionary forces to Cuba should be paid out of the funds of the Cuban treasury."

The authority for the use of the revenues of "occupied territory" is found in the familiar principle of international law which is referred to by Hon. Elihu Root, then Secretary of War, in his letter to the chairman of the Committee on Military Affairs of the House of Representatives, dated May 31, 1902, being House Report No. 2350, Fifty-seventh Congress, first session, and just what procedure was taken and expenditure made is explained in the letter from the then Secretary of War to the Speaker of the House of Representatives, dated May 29, 1900, which is printed as House Document No. 396, Fifty-sixth Congress, first session.

While the present provisional administration of the affairs of the Republic of Cuba is not military but civil in its form, it is in effect and law an assumption of the functions of government. As a necessary corollary to its obligations to maintain stability and to preserve life, liberty, and property, there comes the right to administer and expend such portions of the revenues of the occupied territory as may be necessary for those purposes. Under military occupation the governing control is lodged in the President of the United States. Under the former occupation there was a general direction by the President of the United States for the expenditure of such portions of the revenues of Cuba as might be necessary to maintain peace and order, which extended to all necessary instrumentalities to attain the same. By direction of the Secretary of War, under his order, various expenditures were made by the military governor of Cuba for those objects.

The present government of the island is actually exercised by the President, through the provisional governor of the Republic of Cuba, and he has, by his various decretal orders, appropriated various sums for providing shelter and preserving the health of United States forces on duty in Cuba, to wit:

Decree No. 17, October 13, 1906, general disbursement for necessary expenses from general revenue	\$50,000
Decree No. 105, October 31, 1906, for rents, maintenance and repairs of public buildings, supplying water to troops, disposal of sewage, screening quarters, constructing shelter, necessary labor, and general sanitation	50,000
Decree No. 173, November 24, 1906, for above purposes	30,000

The necessary expenditures for the above objects, and for others necessary to the due administration of the provisional government, are contemplated to be made from time to time. The purposes for such ex-

pensitures are necessary to carry out the beneficial objects of our intervention, and are doomed to be properly payable from the revenues of Cuba, and not of the Government of the United States.

The only question which arises is whether the revenues of the Government of Cuba are sufficient to pay the ordinary expenses of its government and these military expenses besides. I think it might be well to authorize the President or Secretary of War to receive from the Cuban treasury and deposit in the Treasury of the United States such sums as the President shall determine to be equitable and available from the Cuban revenues, and thus reimburse the Treasury of the United States for the expenditures incurred by the United States in the military occupation of the island.

Very respectfully,

SECRETARY OF WAR.

Hon. JAMES A. TAWNEY,  
Chairman Committee on Appropriations,  
House of Representatives, U. S., Washington.

The Clerk read as follows:

#### QUARTERMASTER'S DEPARTMENT.

Regular supplies of the Quartermaster's Department, including their care and protection, consisting of stoves and heating apparatus required for heating offices, hospitals, barracks and quarters, and recruiting stations, and United States military prison; also ranges and stoves, and appliances for cooking and serving food at posts and on transports, and repair and maintenance of such heating and cooking appliances; of fuel and lights for enlisted men, including recruits, guards, hospitals, storehouses, and offices, and for sale to officers, and including also fuel and engine supplies required in the operation of modern batteries at established posts; for post bakeries; for ice machines and their maintenance where required for the health and comfort of the troops and for cold storage; for the construction, operation, and maintenance of laundries at military posts in the United States and its island possessions; for the necessary furniture, text-books, paper, and equipment for the post schools and libraries; for the tableware and mess furniture for kitchens and mess halls, each and all for the enlisted men, including recruits; of forage in kind for the horses, mules, and oxen of the Quartermaster's Department at the several posts and stations and with the armies in the field, and for the horses of the several regiments of cavalry, the batteries of artillery, and such companies of infantry and scouts as may be mounted, and for the authorized number of officers' horses, including bedding for the animals; and nothing in the act making appropriations for the legislative, executive, and judicial expenses of the Government for the fiscal year 1908, or any other act, shall hereafter be held or construed so as to deprive officers of the Army, wherever on duty in the military service of the United States, of forage, bedding, shoeing, or shelter for their authorized number of horses, or of any means of transportation or maintenance therefor for which provision is made by the terms of this act; of straw for soldiers' bedding, and of stationery, including blank books for the Quartermaster's Department, certificates for discharged soldiers, blank forms for the Pay and Quartermaster's Departments, and for printing Department orders and reports, \$5,500,000: *Provided*, That hereafter fuel may be furnished to commissioned officers on the active list by the Quartermaster's Department, for the actual use of such officers only, at the rate of \$3 per cord for standard oak wood, or at an equivalent rate for other kinds of fuel, the amount so furnished to each to be limited to the officer's actual personal necessities as certified to by him: *Provided further*, That no part of the appropriations for the Quartermaster's Department shall be expended on printing, unless the same shall be done by contract after due notice and competition, except in such cases as the emergency will not admit of the giving notice of competition, and in cases where it is impracticable to have the necessary printing done by contract the same may be done, with the approval of the Secretary of War, by the purchase of material and hire of the necessary labor for the purpose. For the fiscal year ending June 30, 1908, whenever the ice machines, steam laundries, and electric plants shall not come in competition with private enterprise for sale to the public, and in the opinion of the Secretary of War it becomes necessary to the economical use and administration of such ice machines, steam laundries, and electric plants as have been or may hereafter be established in pursuance of law, surplus ice may be disposed of, laundry work may be done for other branches of the Government, and surplus electric light and power may be sold on such terms and in accordance with such regulations as may be prescribed by the Secretary of War: *Provided*, That the funds received from such sales and in payment for such laundry work shall be used to defray the cost of operation of said ice, laundry, and electric plants; and the sales and expenditures herein provided for shall be accounted for in accordance with the methods prescribed by law, and any sums remaining, after such cost of maintenance and operation have been defrayed, shall be deposited in the Treasury to the credit of the appropriation from which the cost of operation of such plant is paid.

Mr. FITZGERALD. Mr. Chairman, I raise the point of order against lines 17 and 18, on page 23.

Mr. MANN. Mr. Chairman, I reserve the point of order on the first proviso on page 24, commencing on line 17, and also to the proviso, on page 25, to the clause reading "and surplus electric light and power may be sold on such terms and in accordance with such regulations as may be prescribed by the Secretary of War."

The CHAIRMAN (Mr. PERKINS). Does the gentleman from New York wish to be heard on his point of order?

Mr. FITZGERALD. I would like to ask the gentleman from Iowa some questions.

Mr. HULL. Do I understand the gentleman from Illinois to reserve his point of order to the fuel proviso?

Mr. MANN. Yes.

Mr. HULL. What is the point of order of the gentleman from New York?

Mr. FITZGERALD. I raise the point of order to the proviso for the "construction and operation of laundries." I desire to know how much of this appropriation it is intended shall be expended to construct new laundries.

Mr. HULL. Mr. Chairman, I would say that on the proposi-



tion of the gentleman from New York [Mr. FITZGERALD] that it is impossible for me to give the exact information as to the amount. My understanding is that it is an extension of the work of putting up laundries they have had heretofore at hospitals, and it is a matter of economy at posts to construct them, and that the amounts that would be expended I should imagine would not be very considerable, but would be something.

Mr. FITZGERALD. Mr. Chairman, when this bill was under consideration last session I called the attention of the committee to the fact that in several items a great number of different matters were included and large lump appropriations made. For instance, this particular paragraph appropriates \$5,500,000 for a great number of different items. It is utterly impossible to ascertain either how much is expended for any particular purpose or how much is estimated for that purpose. So far as I am concerned, I said then that I should, as far as I was able, prevent the addition of new language making it possible to do additional things out of such appropriations. These items should have been segregated long ago. The matters should be divided up, so that Members of the House would be able to know just what was being done with the money appropriated.

Mr. HULL. Mr. Chairman, I would say that the different appropriations carry a very large number of items. Congress has never had in detail all the different items specified and the amount to be used for each particular purpose. I doubt if it would be profitable for Congress to have every particular individual item in this large list of materials to be purchased or work to be done estimated for separately and appropriated for separately. I can give the gentleman the only information that I have here in regard to these laundries. I read from the hearings:

The CHAIRMAN. The next is "For the construction, operation, and maintenance of laundries at military posts in the United States and its island possessions." We have had that laundry business up, and I thought that we authorized you to have laundries.

General HUMPHREY. No, sir. We are authorized to do laundry work. We have some laundries that were established by the Medical Department for sanitary reasons. I think it very desirable to provide that at such posts as the Secretary of War may decide require laundries the machinery may be purchased and fuel for operation supplied, so that laundry for the enlisted men may be done in the posts. I have mentioned that in my annual report, and believe the reasons given are excellent. They are as follows:

"There is urgent need at many military posts for laundry facilities for enlisted men. The work could be done much more economically and with greater convenience than under the present system, or want of system, by which enlisted men have to depend upon private establishments outside of the post, thus making a heavy draft upon their meager resources. Established laundries under military control are also desirable for sanitary reasons, as has heretofore been pointed out by the Surgeon-General of the Army. The present method of having enlisted men's laundry work done at all sorts of places outside of military reservations and which are not under sanitary inspection is a constant menace to health, especially in the island possessions.

Those are the reasons for the items. I think it is subject to a point of order, and I hope that point of order will not be made.

Mr. FITZGERALD. I wish to say that I disagree with the gentleman from Iowa that it is not desirable to have the items of these various paragraphs in this bill specially explained. Last session we discovered that \$50,000 had been taken out of the fund for the transportation of the Army in order to test coal. We found a great many instances in which the appropriations were being used for purposes never contemplated by Congress in making the appropriations. In the naval appropriation bill specific appropriations are made for laundries for the barracks of the Marine Corps, and in the estimates of last year \$280,000 was asked to put up laundries in connection with the different Marine Corps barracks. The extent of the Marine Corps is very insignificant compared with the Army itself, and if it will require \$280,000 to build laundries for the Marine Corps I would hesitate very much to permit the Quartermaster-General to have available \$5,500,000 to build laundries for the Army. I know something about the way they use these appropriations. If laundries are required at any specific post, they should be estimated for and passed upon both by the gentleman's committee and by the House. This is simply the opening up of an avenue of great expenditures never yet considered by Congress and not known to Members to be contemplated from a casual examination of the provision. The Book of Estimates for last year shows that the smallest amount, as I recollect, asked for equipping a laundry at a Marine Corps barracks was \$6,000. This appropriation authorizes the construction of laundries at any barracks or at any military post, either in the United States or in the island possessions. An astounding sum could be expended under this provision for laundries. I would ask the gentleman from Iowa if he knows whether the increase of \$500,000 in this appropriation is intended to cover the proposed erection of laundries under this language of the bill?

Mr. HULL. I will say to the gentleman that the increase of

\$500,000 was given because of the increased cost of a great many items here, and we cut what they asked down. The estimate was \$6,350,000, and we cut that estimate down from that amount to \$5,500,000 not on account of laundries, but on account of the belief that they might get through on that amount and it is a limitation upon what they could have. The increase of \$500,000 was not on account of laundries, I will say to the gentleman, and I have no idea the amount expended would be anywhere near \$500,000, because the Secretary of War would select the posts where they are needed most and thus know what they would have left out of the appropriation to carry on the regular work. There is nothing that can be bought under this appropriation except what is specifically mentioned in the appropriation. The abuses to which the gentleman referred a while ago, or what he called abuses, as to tests of coal, etc., were all out of the transportation of the Army and its supplies.

Mr. FITZGERALD. I think there was some in this particular item—

Mr. HULL. There has been a large growth during the years of making that appropriation shoulder everything else that was not specifically provided for, and when we come to that we have required separate estimates for them in the future, but I think to go into a separate estimate of every one of the things enumerated in this would be to burden our record with a mass of detail that would not be of any particular benefit to the Government.

Mr. FITZGERALD. Well, upon that same line of reasoning we might just as well appropriate one lump sum and let them do as they please with it for the Army.

Mr. HULL. I hardly think that would follow.

Mr. FITZGERALD. I imagine that what we are here for is to know something about the purposes for which this money is to be expended; the more detailed information we have the more efficiently we can discharge the duty that devolves upon us.

Mr. HULL. I do believe the reason given by the Quartermaster-General is exceedingly strong in favor of it, and we ought to give the enlisted force of the Army the privilege of having their laundry done inside of the grounds by sanitary methods.

Mr. FITZGERALD. I agree with the gentleman, but I think Congress ought to determine how much should be expended for a laundry and at what particular place it should be expended, just the same as Congress determines just where and how much shall be expended for a hospital, which is of much more importance to the enlisted men.

Mr. HULL. Congress has never done that in regard to barracks and quarters and military posts. We have given a lump sum.

Mr. FITZGERALD. I said hospitals at those places. We have put a limitation so that they can not expend over \$20,000 for any one hospital.

Mr. HULL. In the general hospital appropriation they do not go over \$20,000; that is under the law. But generally it is a lump sum and expended under the direction of the Department.

Mr. FITZGERALD. But under this they could expend any amount they pleased for any one laundry. Mr. Chairman, I insist upon the point of order.

The CHAIRMAN. Does the Chair understand the gentleman from Iowa to resist the point of order?

Mr. HULL. I do not resist the point of order at all.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair sustains the point of order. Does the gentleman from Illinois insist upon his point of order, which he has reserved?

Mr. MANN. Mr. Chairman, I reserve the point of order. I do not think there is any question but the paragraph is subject to the point of order.

Mr. HULL. What is it?

Mr. MANN. On page 24, the first proviso, with reference to the charge which the Government shall make for fuel furnished to the commissioned officers.

Mr. HULL. I will say to the gentleman that is the same provision, as I remember, that we had last year.

Mr. MANN. I understand.

Mr. HULL. And I will say to the gentleman, if the word "hereafter" was in last year, this could go out on the ground that it is reenacted law. I am trying to see what is the case. There has never been a time when the Government has not furnished fuel to officers at a certain fixed price.

Mr. MANN. I understand all of that, but here is a proposition to furnish fuel at a great deal less than cost.

Mr. HULL. Yes.

Mr. MANN. Which means not only the kind that you describe, which is standard oak wood—

Mr. HULL. That has always been the standard.

Mr. MANN. Or hard coal, or soft coal, or anything else the man desires to burn.

Mr. HULL. Each class to be the equivalent of that cord of hard wood.

Mr. MANN. Now, we pay a certain salary to a commissioned officer in the Army.

Mr. HULL. Yes.

Mr. MANN. Thereupon we provide in addition that he shall have so much money for the quarters which he does not get. Then we provide that he shall receive his grocery supplies partly at the expense of the Government. Then we provide that he shall receive his fuel partly at the expense of the Government. Then we provide that he shall have his laundry work done.

Mr. HULL. Oh, no; you do not.

Mr. MANN. You just wanted to put in that provision here.

Mr. HULL. These laundries are for the enlisted men—specifically advocated on that line.

Mr. MANN. I understand the gentleman to say that is what they are advocated for, but the provision of the bill not only authorizes the use of these laundries for the benefit of the commissioned men, but for anybody else in the world.

Mr. HULL. No; they all have to pay.

Mr. MANN. Pay what? A fixed charge regardless of the cost. So that I say it is done partly at the expense of the Government.

Mr. HULL. Now, I will read what we passed last year:

*Provided, That hereafter fuel may be furnished to commissioned officers on the active list by the Quartermaster's Department.*

Mr. Chairman, I am perfectly willing that it should go out. It is simply reenacting existing law.

Mr. MANN. I am perfectly willing it should go out.

Mr. HULL. It goes out because it stays in.

Mr. MANN. That is a question for the Comptroller to determine.

Mr. HULL. The reason for the Government placing fuel at a fixed price is because officers are compelled to go where they are ordered. The same reason that applies to that applies to the rations that are sold to the officers from the commissary stores. Now, under the old law, before the last appropriation act, all of the officers were allowed exactly the same amount for fuel. A man in Cuba got just the same amount allowed that the man in Alaska could buy, and a man in Alaska could not buy a pound more. That was not fair. A man is sent to Alaska in pursuance of the policy of the Government, and he ought not to be compelled, as he would in some places there, to spend practically all of his salary to keep himself warm during the winter and be at a disadvantage with the man who is in a warmer country. It is to equalize the conditions that this was put in, granting an increased allowance under certain conditions. The officer in a cold country is still at a disadvantage. The Government has never, probably, made its fuel account come out even on what they let the officers have. It has never come out even on its commissary account with what it has supplied. And yet the very nature of the service required this must be equalized or else the man with the most undesirable billet in which to serve as an officer would be ruined by the Government on account of such service.

Mr. MANN. Mr. Chairman, I do not know that there will be any objection to letting the officers have fuel partly at the expense of the Government, but it will be highly desirable, if it were possible, for Congress to ascertain what is the compensation paid to the officers in the Army and Navy and other officials of the Government. The gentleman in charge of the bill is not able to tell. I do not think there is an Army officer who can tell.

Mr. KEIFER. Oh, yes.

Mr. MANN. Well, the gentleman from Ohio thinks he can. Let us see.

Mr. KEIFER. No; I did not say that. I stated that the Army officers could.

Mr. MANN. They get their privileges, but nobody knows what is the amount of their compensation. They are provided with a salary, a home, then we let them have partly at our expense their groceries, and we let them have partly at our expense their fuel supplies. We have omitted to add part of the expense of the unnecessary and costly uniforms which the Army Regulations require them to purchase. But nobody knows what the compensation amounts to, and what these things that they get amount to.

Mr. HULL. The amount paid for groceries is more than the amount these articles cost the Government, because 10 per cent is added in all cases, and where transportation has not been included it more than pays the cost to the Government.

Mr. MANN. Is it not a fact that groceries or anything else are not purchased by the officer from the Government unless he can purchase them at the same price or lower price than he can from the grocer?

Mr. HULL. Oh, in the great staple articles the Government, with the 10 per cent added to the original cost, can supply them in all thickly settled parts of the country cheaper than the grocer; but it does not entail a loss on the Government in these cases.

Mr. MANN. The gentleman must not misunderstand me. I do not say it is wrong to do it, but I am seeking to find out, if anybody can tell me, in the midst of the constant demand for increase now prevailing perhaps all over this country; and I would like to inquire what they now get.

Mr. HULL. Take a captain. He gets \$1,800 a year.

Mr. MANN. That is his salary.

Mr. HULL. Now, he gets no allowance for quarters unless he is stationed in a city where the Government does not own quarters.

Mr. MANN. And if it does not, under this bill he gets \$36 a month.

Mr. HULL. If he is at a post, he has three rooms allotted to him; where there are no quarters he gets \$36 per month.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. HULL. I ask unanimous consent that I may give this explanation for the benefit of my distinguished friend from Illinois.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection? [After a pause.] The Chair hears none.

Mr. HULL. Now, he gets that \$1,800; then he gets a 10 per cent increase on that every five years up to 40 per cent increase. So that if he serves twenty years he gets 40 per cent additional pay on account of longevity service. Now, that is called the "longevity" or "bogey" pay, and this can not go beyond the 40 per cent.

Mr. MANN. That is the salary.

Mr. HULL. That is the salary of a captain. Now, he gets the privilege of purchasing such commissary stores as he may desire to purchase from the Government at the cost to the Government, with 10 per cent added.

Mr. MANN. How does anybody know how much that will be, or whether they will buy any?

Mr. HULL. A great many of them do not buy anything.

Mr. MANN. How much does the Government lose in paying out the money in that way?

Mr. HULL. I should say a very trifling sum.

Mr. MANN. Has the gentleman sufficient knowledge to be able to guess?

Mr. HULL. Nobody could tell, unless they could figure each individual purchase and balance profit and loss.

Mr. MANN. That is what I say.

Mr. HULL. It would be so trifling a sum that the gentleman from Illinois would not consider it.

Mr. MANN. I do not see how the gentleman can say it is a trifling sum. What is a cord of standard oak wood worth in the District of Columbia to-day?

Mr. OLMSTED. Eight dollars.

Mr. HULL. The whole of the time that they are at a post they get fuel allowed up to a certain amount at a certain rate. They now get what they need at such a rate. It may not be wood, but can be the equivalent in heating power of wood.

Mr. MANN. It would cost the Government \$8 a cord, and they would get it at three, so that at least part of it would be at the expense of the Government.

Mr. HULL. I will ask the gentleman how much his fuel costs him?

Mr. MANN. It costs a great deal. I can tell the gentleman to provide fuel for my modest house here it costs me from \$150 to \$250 a year.

Mr. HULL. That is a very high price.

Mr. MANN. I burn a great deal of wood, for which we have to pay out of our own pockets and receive no assistance from the Government.

Mr. HULL. But the gentleman must remember that these officers pay a very large part of it out of their pockets.

Mr. MANN. Why not?

Mr. HULL. Why, yes.

Mr. MANN. The Government pays a large part of it.

Mr. HULL. No; it does not pay the larger part.

Mr. MANN. It costs the Government \$8 a cord for the wood, and they are only charged three.

Mr. HULL. I think I will undertake to furnish the gentleman with all the wood he wants, if he will take it in considerable quantities, for five dollars and a half a cord.

Mr. MANN. I will take a cord, then, at five dollars and a half. The gentleman is called right now. [Laughter.]

Mr. HULL. I said "in considerable quantities."

Mr. MANN. Oh, nobody buys these things in considerable quantities. We buy them at retail.



Mr. HULL. The Government buys largely at wholesale. I think I can tell the gentleman within a hundred dollars a year all that a captain of the Army gets out of his pay and allowances.

Mr. MANN. I think the gentleman is wide of the mark more than a thousand dollars a year.

Mr. HULL. That is quite a difference of opinion.

Mr. MANN. Yes.

Mr. HULL. And while I ordinarily bow with the greatest respect to the judgment of the gentleman from Illinois, I am compelled at this time to doubt his having figured on the question at all.

The CHAIRMAN (Mr. PERKINS). Does the gentleman from Illinois insist on his point of order?

Mr. MANN. Certainly.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair sustains the point of order on the proviso beginning with the word "Provided," in line 17, on page 24.

Mr. HULL. I concede the point of order, simply on the ground that it is a reenactment of existing law.

Mr. MANN. I should like to ask the gentleman from Iowa what is the reason why the Government should engage in the business of making and selling electric light and power at Army posts?

Mr. HULL. That question was gone into pretty fully last year. It is for the reason that at a great many of these places there are no private electrical plants, there is no ice made, and the people of the locality are favored by the privilege of purchasing it, and it makes no expense to the Government.

Mr. MANN. I was not referring to the provision with reference to ice. I can understand that, but I ask about electric power and light.

Mr. HULL. It is for the same reason, that at many of the Army posts they have electric power, while the villagers have none, and where they can purchase it from the Government it is of great advantage to them, and the amount received for it is covered into the Treasury.

Mr. MANN. Then the gentleman thinks this is an advantageous thing.

Mr. HULL. Provided they do not enter into competition with any private concern, and the Quartermaster-General says there has been no controversy raised at any place, but that it has been a great boon to the people living in these places.

Mr. MANN. I withdraw the point of order on that.

The CHAIRMAN. The point of order is withdrawn. The gentleman, as the Chair understands, has a further point of order reserved. The gentleman reserved a point of order on page 25.

Mr. MANN. That is the one I withdraw. The other one, on page 24, is the one I insisted upon, and that was sustained. I withdraw the point of order on page 25.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Illinois withdraws the point of order.

Mr. HULL. Concerning the provision on page 24, a reading of the law of last year shows that this is simply a reenactment of the law as it was last year.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair so understands.

Mr. HULL. It is a reenactment of the present law.

The Clerk read as follows:

For barracks and quarters for troops of the Seacoast Artillery, \$1,300,000: *Provided*, That hereafter no part of the appropriations for barracks and quarters shall be expended at brigade posts unless by authority of Congress, and no part of this appropriation shall be expended at posts proposed to be abandoned.

Mr. TAWNEY. I desire to reserve a point of order on this paragraph.

Mr. MILLER. I desire to reserve a point of order to that part of the provision in the last section which is new legislation, "that hereafter no part of the appropriations for barracks and quarters shall be expended at brigade posts unless by authority of Congress."

Mr. TAWNEY. I reserve a point of order on the entire paragraph.

The CHAIRMAN (Mr. CURRIER). The gentleman from Kansas makes a point of order against the entire paragraph, as the Chair understands.

Mr. MILLER. No; against the proviso.

Mr. TAWNEY. I make the point of order against the entire paragraph.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Minnesota makes the point of order against the entire paragraph. Does the gentleman from Iowa desire to be heard on the point of order?

Mr. HULL. I should like to hear what the gentleman bases his point on.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair does not care to hear from the gentleman from Minnesota.

Mr. HULL. Then the Chair and the gentleman from Minnesota have discussed it? I supposed the Chair would want to know what the gentleman from Minnesota based his point on, unless he had discussed it with the gentleman.

The CHAIRMAN. No; the Chair has had no discussion with the gentleman from Minnesota, but it is very apparent to the Chair why the point of order is made.

Mr. TAWNEY. The Chair can well admit that the gentleman from Minnesota has not even suggested the point of order to the Chair until now. The gentleman from Iowa is well aware of the fact that this provision is for the construction of new work. It is a provision that has always been carried in the sundry civil bill. The Committee on Military Affairs therefore had no jurisdiction of the subject-matter of the paragraph, as evidenced by the provision now carried in the sundry civil bill, which reads as follows:

Military posts: For the construction and enlargement of buildings at such military posts as, in the judgment of the Secretary of War, may be necessary; for the erection of barracks and quarters for the artillery in connection with adopted project for seacoast defenses, and for the purchase of suitable building sites for said barracks and quarters, \$825,000, of which sum \$1,000 may be used under direction of the Secretary of War for examination, survey, and plans for an adequate water supply for Fort William Henry Harrison, in the State of Montana; but no part of the money appropriated for military posts shall be used for the purchase of any land except as herein specially provided.

The matter is new legislation in this provision, and it is not germane to the bill reported by the Committee on Military Affairs.

Mr. HULL. Mr. Chairman, I desire to be heard. I have no question in my mind that the Committee on Military Affairs has jurisdiction over barracks and quarters for the line of the Army, whether at seacoast defenses or otherwise. Even if the Committee on Appropriations has heretofore had this matter, gives it no jurisdiction under the rule. In this appropriation this year there were two appropriations submitted by the estimates; that of itself carries with it no jurisdiction, I am willing to concede, because it is in the estimates, but for the artillery even seacoast defenses is just as much under the jurisdiction of the Committee on Military Affairs up to the limit that has been heretofore carried in these bills by the two committees as the buildings at any other post in the country. I suppose we have no jurisdiction whatever to say where these posts shall be located, and we claim none on that. The Committee on Appropriations, having jurisdiction of fortification bills, locate all the fortifications of the country. But giving them the location of fortifications, it does not follow that they buy the clothing; they do not buy the overcoats; they do not buy any of the clothing of the artillery, and they have no more jurisdiction over the barracks and quarters on account of locating the place where the guns shall be emplaced than they have over the overcoats of soldiers.

It seems to me because of this division heretofore we have appropriated for barracks and quarters, and part of the money has been expended at these posts. There has been no restriction upon it; it was simply barracks and quarters. I see no reason why the point of order should be raised against this appropriation simply because in this bill the committee has segregated the items and so appropriate that money for one class of quarters can not be used for another class. If we appropriated in the usual way all could be used at interior posts or all at seacoast defenses. Separating and making specific does not change the matter.

Mr. TAWNEY. Mr. Chairman, one word in reply. It is not that I care anything personally about the jurisdiction between the two committees, but it has always been the policy of Congress, upon the initiation of the Committee on Appropriations, to keep separate and distinct the cost of maintaining the Army and the expense incident to that maintenance and the cost for new construction for new posts. That was the policy of Congress when the Committee on Appropriations had jurisdiction of both the Army appropriation bill and the sundry civil bill. It was for the purpose of enabling Congress to at all times determine from the Army appropriation bill what it was costing the people of the United States to maintain the Army and what it was costing for such new construction or new posts that were not necessarily incident to the maintenance of the Army.

Now, that division was carefully maintained when the Committee on Appropriations had jurisdiction of both bills, and when the jurisdiction over the Army bill was taken from that committee nothing went from the Committee on Appropriations except the items incident to and necessarily involved in the maintenance of the Army. From that time until to-day the Committee on Appropriations have carried in their appropriation bill the provision provided for here.

I think the policy is a good one; I believe it should be maintained. There is no feeling at all on the part of the Committee

on Appropriations because of the attempt to take from the Committee on Appropriations this jurisdiction, but it will necessarily result in the abolition of that policy which I believe to be wise and correct—the policy that enables Congress and the country at all times to know what it is costing to maintain the Army and what the new construction is costing the people incident to the existence of the Army. I think there can be no question whatever about the point of order being well taken, because it does not belong to this bill.

Mr. HULL. Mr. Chairman, I would like to say one word in regard to what has been said by the gentleman from Minnesota that the military bill provides only for the actual cost of maintaining the Army. The answer to that is seen in every appropriation bill since the division of power in the House and the taking away from the Committee on Appropriations of certain appropriations. There has not been a single appropriation bill from the Military Committee that has not provided for barracks and quarters, not one. It is true that when the Committee on Appropriations had the entire subject under its control there was carried in the sundry civil appropriation bill the appropriation for buildings costing more than \$20,000, and in the Army appropriation bill appropriations for buildings costing less than \$20,000. Yet, unless you construe the language in which they make it as waiving the law, they have violated the law every time they have brought in an appropriation for a larger building. The same law that they invoke against the Military Committee applies to them. It is found on page 281 of the military laws of the United States, and it says:

Permanent barracks or quarters and buildings and structures of a permanent nature shall not be constructed unless detailed estimates shall have been previously submitted to Congress and approved by special appropriations for the same, except when constructed by the troops; and no such structures the cost of which shall exceed \$20,000 shall be erected unless by special authority of Congress.

Now, we have carried barracks and quarters in the military bill every year since the division of power. We are entitled to that at least. We have jurisdiction of it. If the gentleman were correct that we are only to legislate on the military bill for the actual expenses of supporting the Army, why have we done all these other things that have been in the nature of construction for every year since the Committee on Military Affairs has had jurisdiction?

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair will ask the gentleman from Iowa if this committee has ever before taken jurisdiction of barracks for seacoast artillery on an appropriation bill?

Mr. HULL. It has never been asked specifically for that. But under our appropriation for barracks and quarters, not limiting it to any other than coast artillery, every dollar we appropriate could have been used there, and much of it has been.

The CHAIRMAN. But the Chair asked the gentleman from Iowa if the bill under consideration does not provide for barracks and quarters for troops other than seacoast artillery.

Mr. HULL. We divided it for this reason: That the appropriation asked for by the two committees had gone beyond the amount that the evidence showed the Department needed for this purpose. If we had appropriated in the other way, as we have done heretofore, it would have meant that they could use every dollar at the seacoast defenses, or they could use every dollar and let that out. The two appropriations asked for from the two committees exceeded by a million of dollars the amount that the Chief of Artillery stated would be necessary. We wanted to make it specific, so that they could not divert this money they asked for from one purpose to another. That is all. We have simply changed the language of the appropriation to make it specific, that they could not use what they ask for for seacoast barracks and quarters at other posts and what they ask for at other posts at the seacoast. Heretofore they could use every dollar at the seacoast defenses or they could refuse to use a dollar there, as they might desire. It does seem to me that simply making it specific does not change it. The only question that can arise is whether a dollar of this money can be used for any building costing more than \$20,000, and, in my judgment, it can not under this provision and under the law I have just read.

If we desire to appropriate more than \$20,000 to a building, it would be necessary for us to specify each building, and then the same law would apply to the Committee on Military Affairs that applies to the Committee on Appropriations, and the only difference in the language of the appropriation heretofore is that they call it "for military posts" and we call it "for barracks and quarters." It is identically the same thing, and they put in this language, "subject to the discretion of the Secretary of War," and hold that that waives the law and that he can put all the money in one building if he wants to. I think the intent of the law rigidly carried out by Congress would be that you

have got to appropriate on detailed estimates for every building that costs more than \$20,000, and you have got to make a specific appropriation for the building under the law.

Mr. KAHN. Mr. Chairman, in addition to what the gentleman from Iowa has just said, I would like to make this suggestion: It must be apparent that the Committee on Military Affairs has jurisdiction over this matter; otherwise you would have this anomalous condition. The Military Committee could come in here and make a recommendation for the increase of the Army, and yet they would not be able to furnish quarters for that increase. Therefore I maintain that they have that authority and have always exercised that authority.

Mr. HULL. Let me submit this to the Chairman, just this one proposition. Suppose the Committee on Military Affairs, in place of trying to safeguard this appropriation, had simply said "for barracks and quarters, \$6,325,000," as the Department asks. They could have used every dollar of it for what is set out here, submitted in the estimates, not only the \$1,300,000, but the whole six million on the coast defenses if they had desired it, because there is no limitation in the language of the estimates and has never been any limitation in former appropriation bills. The Chairman will find on page 37 of the hearings before the Military Committee the matter fully set out for what they desire it. That is the information that enables us to segregate the two items. If we had appropriated as we have heretofore, they could have used \$6,000,000 for seacoast defense if they had that number of buildings costing less than \$20,000 each.

Mr. TAWNEY. Will the gentleman from Iowa permit a question?

Mr. HULL. Certainly.

Mr. TAWNEY. Is it not a fact there is no estimate made in the estimates submitted under the Army bill for this appropriation?

Mr. HULL. There is an estimate submitted in the estimates for the Army bill for \$1,373,000.

Mr. TAWNEY. It is also a fact that the estimate for this item of barracks and quarters, Seacoast Artillery, is submitted as an estimate in the sundry civil expenses of the Government.

Mr. HULL. Just as they do for military posts; and, Mr. Chairman, that is one of the great evils of this class of legislation where two committees have jurisdiction concurrently over the same matters, where if a building costs less than \$20,000 they go to one committee and if it costs more than \$20,000 it goes to another, making two divisions. They have submitted to the committee in the sundry civil estimate for a certain amount for the same purposes, not only seacoast, but all posts. They claim that those buildings cost more than \$20,000. They make this estimate to the Military Committee for \$1,373,000 for buildings that could be built and have been built heretofore under the law under the appropriation carried by this bill.

The CHAIRMAN. The suggestion of the Chairman at the time the point of order was made that he did not care to hear the gentleman from Minnesota was based upon the fact that this paragraph is out of order regardless of the question of jurisdiction. This limitation is not confined to this appropriation, but is general in its terms, "Provided, That hereafter," etc., and the Chair sustains the point of order.

Mr. HULL. Let me ask the Chairman if he sustains the point of order to the whole paragraph or to the proviso?

The CHAIRMAN. If any part of the paragraph is out of order, the whole paragraph is out of order.

Mr. HULL. Then, Mr. Chairman, I offer the following amendment: "For barracks and quarters for troops of the Seacoast Artillery, \$1,300,000."

Mr. TAWNEY. I make the point of order against the amendment, Mr. Chairman.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Iowa offers the following amendment, which the Clerk will report.

The Clerk read as follows:

Insert after line 2, page 31, the following:  
"For barracks and quarters for troops of the Seacoast Artillery, \$1,300,000."

The CHAIRMAN. And against that the gentleman from Minnesota raises the point of order. The Chair would like to ask the gentleman from Iowa what committee in the past has actually appropriated the money that has built the barracks for the Seacoast Artillery?

Mr. HULL. I should say that the amount over \$20,000 in a building had been appropriated by the Committee on Appropriations, and that all costing \$20,000 and less by the Committee on Military Affairs.

The CHAIRMAN. Well, has the gentleman any positive knowledge what committee has actually appropriated the money which has gone to build this class of buildings?



Mr. HULL. I have not, but if the Chair will hold the matter up until to-morrow morning I can give positive knowledge one way or the other.

Mr. TAWNEY. I wish to say in reply to the Chair that the construction of barracks and quarters for the Army out of the appropriations made by the Military Committee have been made out of the general appropriation expended under the statute passed, as I now recollect it, in 1843, and have applied exclusively to barracks and quarters of the Army, not the seacoast defense at all, with a limit on the expenditure to \$20,000 for each building. That is the only appropriation that has ever come from the Committee on Military Affairs relating to barracks and quarters. No appropriation has ever been made—

The CHAIRMAN. You are referring to Seacoast Artillery?

Mr. TAWNEY. I am not referring to Seacoast Artillery.

The CHAIRMAN. To barracks generally.

Mr. TAWNEY. To barracks of the Army. If there is any appropriation for seacoast defense it has been carried heretofore in the sundry civil appropriation bill.

Mr. HULL. As a separate item; have you carried it as a separate item or as military posts?

Mr. TAWNEY. Carried it just as we carry it in the current law. It is for military posts, and in the body of the item "For the erection of barracks and quarters for the artillery in connection with the adopted project for seacoast defense and for the purchase of suitable building sites," etc.

It is under the title "Military posts," but the language of the law especially authorizes the appropriation for the erection of barracks and quarters for the seacoast artillery in connection with adopted projects for seacoast defenses. That is the language of the appropriation for this purpose in the sundry civil bill, and always has been.

Mr. HULL. Mr. Chairman, I move that the committee do now rise.

The motion was agreed to.

Accordingly the committee rose; and the Speaker having resumed the chair, Mr. CURRIER, the Chairman of the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union, reported that the committee had had under consideration the bill (H. R. 23551) making appropriation for the support of the Army for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1908, and had come to no resolution thereon.

#### FORTIFICATION APPROPRIATION BILL.

Mr. SMITH of Iowa, a member of the Committee on Appropriations, reported the bill (H. R. 23821) making appropriations for fortifications and other works of defense, for the armament thereof, for the procurement of heavy ordnance for trial and service, and for other purposes; which was read the first and second time, and referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union, and, with the accompanying report, ordered to be printed.

Mr. WILLIAMS. I desire to reserve all points of order.

#### WITHDRAWAL OF PAPERS.

Mr. DOVENER, by unanimous consent, was granted leave to withdraw from the files of the House, without leaving copies, the papers in the case of Ella F. Sydnor, H. R. 1763, Fifty-sixth Congress, no adverse report having been made thereon.

Also, to withdraw from the files of the House, without leaving copies, the papers in the case of John F. Starcher, H. R. 10167, Fifty-seventh Congress, no adverse report having been made thereon.

Mr. ROBINSON of Arkansas, by unanimous consent, was granted leave to withdraw from the files of the House, without leaving copies, papers in the case of Fannie Hay Maffit, H. R. 3968, Fifty-ninth Congress, and H. R. 7230, Fifty-eighth Congress, no adverse report having been made thereon.

#### ADJOURNMENT.

Mr. HULL. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House do now adjourn.

The motion was agreed to.

Accordingly (at 4 o'clock and 43 minutes p. m.) the House adjourned.

#### EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS.

Under clause 2 of Rule XXIV, the following executive communications were taken from the Speaker's table and referred as follows:

A letter from the Acting Secretary of the Treasury, transmitting, with a copy of a letter from the Secretary of War, an estimate of deficiency appropriation for the War Department—to the Committee on Appropriations, and ordered to be printed.

A letter from the Secretary of War, transmitting, with a letter from the Chief of Engineers, report of examination and survey of Long Island channel and Rockaway Inlet, New York—

to the Committee on Rivers and Harbors, and ordered to be printed, with illustrations.

A letter from the Secretary of War, transmitting, with a letter from the Chief of Engineers, report of examination and survey of Newark Bay and Passaic River, New Jersey—to the Committee on Rivers and Harbors, and ordered to be printed.

A letter from the Secretary of War, transmitting, with a letter from the Chief of Engineers, report of examination and survey of Columbia River and tributaries, Oregon and Washington—to the Committee on Rivers and Harbors, and ordered to be printed.

A letter from the Secretary of the Interior, transmitting papers in the pension case of Mary Murray, with recommendations of relief—to the Committee on Pensions.

#### REPORTS OF COMMITTEES ON PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS.

Under clause 2 of Rule XIII, bills and resolutions of the following titles were severally reported from committees, delivered to the Clerk, and referred to the several Calendars therein named, as follows:

Mr. BIRDSALL, from the Committee on the Merchant Marine and Fisheries, to which was referred the bill of the Senate (S. 6855) to amend the act approved August 19, 1890, entitled, "An act to adopt regulations for preventing collisions at sea," reported the same without amendment, accompanied by a report (No. 6055); which said bill and report were referred to the House Calendar.

Mr. LACEY, from the Committee on the Public Lands, to which was referred the joint resolution of the House (H. J. Res. 190) extending protection of second proviso of section 1 of the act of December 21, 1904, to certain entrymen, reported the same without amendment, accompanied by a report (No. 6120); which said bill and report were referred to the House Calendar.

#### REPORTS OF COMMITTEES ON PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS.

Under clause 2 of Rule XIII, private bills and resolutions of the following titles were severally reported from committees, delivered to the Clerk, and referred to the Committee of the Whole House, as follows:

Mr. CUSHMAN, from the Committee on Private Land Claims, to which was referred the bill of the Senate (S. 5531) for the relief of Francisco Krebs, reported the same without amendment, accompanied by a report (No. 6054); which said bill and report were referred to the Private Calendar.

Mr. BUTLER of Pennsylvania, from the Committee on Naval Affairs, to which was referred the bill of the House (H. R. 22291) to authorize the reappointment of Harry McL. P. Huse to the active list of the Navy, reported the same with amendment, accompanied by a report (No. 6056); which said bill and report were referred to the Private Calendar.

Mr. SOUTHARD, from the Committee on War Claims, to which was referred the bill of the House (H. R. 15562) providing for the payment of an amount found by the Court of Claims to be due John J. Vincent, reported the same with amendment, accompanied by a report (No. 6057); which said bill and report were referred to the Private Calendar.

Mr. MAHON, from the Committee on War Claims, to which was referred the bill of the House (H. R. 16793) for the relief of A. Boschke, civil engineer, reported the same without amendment, accompanied by a report (No. 6058); which said bill and report were referred to the Private Calendar.

He also, from the same committee, to which was referred the bill of the House (H. R. 19354) granting three months' pay proper to Henry C. Pearson, reported the same without amendment, accompanied by a report (No. 6059); which said bill and report were referred to the Private Calendar.

Mr. HOLLIDAY, from the Committee on War Claims, to which was referred the bill of the House (H. R. 20069) for the relief of John D. McLain, reported the same without amendment, accompanied by a report (No. 6060); which said bill and report were referred to the Private Calendar.

Mr. SIMS, from the Committee on War Claims, to which was referred the bill of the House H. R. 874, reported in lieu thereof a resolution (H. Res. 680) referring to the Court of Claims the papers in the case of Peter Dougherty, accompanied by a report (No. 6064); which said resolution and report were referred to the Private Calendar.

Mr. HOLLIDAY, from the Committee on War Claims, to which was referred the bill of the House H. R. 1257, reported in lieu thereof a resolution (H. Res. 681) referring to the Court of Claims the papers in the case of William Offutt, deceased, accompanied by a report (No. 6065); which said resolution and report were referred to the Private Calendar.

He also, from the same committee, to which was referred the bill of the House H. R. 1258, reported in lieu thereof a resolution (H. Res. 682) referring to the Court of Claims the papers in the case of William Taylor, accompanied by a report (No. 6066); which said resolution and report were referred to the Private Calendar.

Mr. HAUGEN, from the Committee on War Claims, to which was referred the bill of the House H. R. 1446, reported in lieu thereof a resolution (H. Res. 683) referring to the Court of Claims the papers in the case of Lucy M. Fisher, accompanied by a report (No. 6067); which said resolution and report were referred to the Private Calendar.

Mr. CLAYTON, from the Committee on War Claims, to which was referred the bill of the House H. R. 2167, reported in lieu thereof a resolution (H. Res. 684) referring to the Court of Claims the papers in the case of William W. Callahan, administrator, accompanied by a report (No. 6068); which said resolution and report were referred to the Private Calendar.

He also, from the same committee, to which was referred the bill of the House H. R. 2166, reported in lieu thereof a resolution (H. Res. 685) referring to the Court of Claims the papers in the case of Salina E. Lauderdale, accompanied by a report (No. 6069); which said resolution and report were referred to the Private Calendar.

Mr. HOLLIDAY, from the Committee on War Claims, to which was referred the bill of the House H. R. 1571, reported in lieu thereof a resolution (H. Res. 686) referring to the Court of Claims the papers in the case of Joseph White, deceased, accompanied by a report (No. 6070); which said resolution and report were referred to the Private Calendar.

Mr. CLAYTON, from the Committee on War Claims, to which was referred the bill of the House H. R. 2993, reported in lieu thereof a resolution (H. Res. 687) referring to the Court of Claims the papers in the case of Mrs. E. W. Williams, accompanied by a report (No. 6071); which said resolution and report were referred to the Private Calendar.

Mr. LEE, from the Committee on War Claims, to which was referred the bill of the House H. R. 3474, reported in lieu thereof a resolution (H. Res. 688) referring to the Court of Claims the papers in the case of J. B. Chandler and D. B. Cox, accompanied by a report (No. 6072); which said resolution and report were referred to the Private Calendar.

Mr. HAUGEN, from the Committee on War Claims, to which was referred the bill of the House H. R. 3824, reported in lieu thereof a resolution (H. Res. 689) referring to the Court of Claims the papers in the case of Mason Shipman, accompanied by a report (No. 6073); which said resolution and report were referred to the Private Calendar.

Mr. OTJEN, from the Committee on War Claims, to which was referred the bill of the House H. R. 3827, reported in lieu thereof a resolution (H. Res. 690) referring to the Court of Claims the papers in the case of Luther H. Potterfield, accompanied by a report (No. 6074); which said resolution and report were referred to the Private Calendar.

Mr. HAUGEN, from the Committee on War Claims, to which was referred the bill of the House H. R. 3902, reported in lieu thereof a resolution (H. Res. 691) referring to the Court of Claims the papers in the case of Napoleon B. Watkins, accompanied by a report (No. 6075); which said resolution and report were referred to the Private Calendar.

Mr. LEE, from the Committee on War Claims, to which was referred the bill of the House H. R. 3903, reported in lieu thereof a resolution (H. Res. 692) referring to the Court of Claims the papers in the case of George M. Fry, accompanied by a report (No. 6076); which said resolution and report were referred to the Private Calendar.

He also, from the same committee, to which was referred the bill of the House H. R. 3919, reported in lieu thereof a resolution (H. Res. 693) referring to the Court of Claims the papers in the case of Virginia E. Ficklin and James W. Ficklin, accompanied by a report (No. 6077); which said resolution and report were referred to the Private Calendar.

Mr. HAUGEN, from the Committee on War Claims, to which was referred the bill of the House H. R. 3957, reported in lieu thereof a resolution (H. Res. 694) referring to the Court of Claims the papers in the case of John McDermott, accompanied by a report (No. 6078); which said resolution and report were referred to the Private Calendar.

Mr. LEE, from the Committee on War Claims, to which was referred the bill of the House H. R. 4902, reported in lieu thereof a resolution (H. Res. 695) referring to the Court of Claims the papers in the case of J. W. McConnell, accompanied by a report (No. 6079); which said resolution and report were referred to the Private Calendar.

Mr. CLAYTON, from the Committee on War Claims, to which

was referred the bill of the House H. R. 5078, reported in lieu thereof a resolution (H. Res. 696) referring to the Court of Claims the papers in the case of the estate of John Hogan, accompanied by a report (No. 6080); which said resolution and report were referred to the Private Calendar.

Mr. SIMS, from the Committee on War Claims, to which was referred the bill of the House H. R. 5942, reported in lieu thereof a resolution (H. Res. 697) referring to the Court of Claims the papers in the case of the estate of Richard M. Harrison, deceased, accompanied by a report (No. 6081); which said resolution and report were referred to the Private Calendar.

He also, from the same committee, to which was referred the bill of the House H. R. 5943, reported in lieu thereof a resolution (H. Res. 698) referring to the Court of Claims the papers in the case of W. H. Harrison, accompanied by a report (No. 6082); which said resolution and report were referred to the Private Calendar.

Mr. OTJEN, from the Committee on War Claims, to which was referred the bill of the House H. R. 5947, reported in lieu thereof a resolution (H. Res. 699) referring to the Court of Claims the papers in the case of Richard Wiseman, deceased, accompanied by a report (No. 6083); which said resolution and report were referred to the Private Calendar.

Mr. SIMS, from the Committee on War Claims, to which was referred the bill of the House H. R. 5951, reported in lieu thereof a resolution (H. Res. 700) referring to the Court of Claims the papers in the case of Lettie Myers, accompanied by a report (No. 6084); which said resolution and report were referred to the Private Calendar.

He also, from the same committee, to which was referred the bill of the House H. R. 6456, reported in lieu thereof a resolution (H. Res. 701) referring to the Court of Claims the papers in the case of Robert H. Holland, accompanied by a report (No. 6085); which said resolution and report were referred to the Private Calendar.

Mr. SPIGHT, from the Committee on War Claims, to which was referred the bill of the House H. R. 7614, reported in lieu thereof a resolution (H. Res. 702) referring to the Court of Claims the papers in the case of Peter Sheets, deceased, accompanied by a report (No. 6086); which said resolution and report were referred to the Private Calendar.

Mr. CLAYTON, from the Committee on War Claims, to which was referred the bill of the House H. R. 7646, reported in lieu thereof a resolution (H. Res. 703) referring to the Court of Claims the papers in the case of Johnson Miller, deceased, accompanied by a report (No. 6087); which said resolution and report were referred to the Private Calendar.

Mr. KENNEDY of Nebraska, from the Committee on War Claims, to which was referred the bill of the House H. R. 7779, reported in lieu thereof a resolution (H. Res. 704) referring to the Court of Claims the papers in the case of Protestant Orphan Asylum at Natchez, Miss., accompanied by a report (No. 6088); which said resolution and report were referred to the Private Calendar.

Mr. SIMS, from the Committee on War Claims, to which was referred the bill of the House H. R. 7817, reported in lieu thereof a resolution (H. Res. 705) referring to the Court of Claims the papers in the case of the heirs and representatives of Thomas B. Benson, deceased, accompanied by a report (No. 6089); which said resolution and report were referred to the Private Calendar.

Mr. CLAYTON, from the Committee on War Claims, to which was referred the bill of the House H. R. 9049, reported in lieu thereof a resolution (H. Res. 706) referring to the Court of Claims the papers in the case of the relief of estate of Bennett Robertson, deceased, accompanied by a report (No. 6090); which said resolution and report were referred to the Private Calendar.

Mr. PATTERSON of South Carolina, from the Committee on War Claims, to which was referred the bill of the House H. R. 9348, reported in lieu thereof a resolution (H. Res. 707) referring to the Court of Claims the papers in the case of Edwin Calhoun, accompanied by a report (No. 6091); which said resolution and report were referred to the Private Calendar.

He also, from the same committee, to which was referred the bill of the House H. R. 9349, reported in lieu thereof a resolution (H. Res. 708) referring to the Court of Claims the papers in the case of W. F. Parker, accompanied by a report (No. 6092); which said resolution and report were referred to the Private Calendar.

Mr. HAUGEN, from the Committee on War Claims, to which was referred the bill of the House H. R. 11195, reported in lieu thereof a resolution (H. Res. 709) referring to the Court of Claims the papers in the case of the estate of Josiah Parnell, deceased, accompanied by a report (No. 6093); which said resolution and report were referred to the Private Calendar.



Mr. PATTERSON of South Carolina, from the Committee on War Claims, to which was referred the bill of the House H. R. 11697, reported in lieu thereof a resolution (H. Res. 710) referring to the Court of Claims the papers in the case of W. H. Padrick, deceased, accompanied by a report (No. 6094); which said resolution and report were referred to the Private Calendar.

Mr. LEE, from the Committee on War Claims, to which was referred the bill of the House H. R. 11828, reported in lieu thereof a resolution (H. Res. 711) referring to the Court of Claims the papers in the case of Henry Gannon, deceased, accompanied by a report (No. 6095); which said resolution and report were referred to the Private Calendar.

Mr. FULKERSON, from the Committee on War Claims, to which was referred the bill of the House H. R. 11830, reported in lieu thereof a resolution (H. Res. 712) referring to the Court of Claims the papers in the case of Oliver Milburn, deceased, accompanied by a report (No. 6096); which said resolution and report were referred to the Private Calendar.

He also, from the same committee, to which was referred the bill of the House H. R. 11831, reported in lieu thereof a resolution (H. Res. 713) referring to the Court of Claims the papers in the case of John Whittington, accompanied by a report (No. 6097); which said resolution and report were referred to the Private Calendar.

Mr. LEE, from the Committee on War Claims, to which was referred the bill of the House H. R. 11857, reported in lieu thereof a resolution (H. Res. 714) referring to the Court of Claims the papers in the case of the estate of James Johnson, deceased, accompanied by a report (No. 6098); which said resolution and report were referred to the Private Calendar.

Mr. FULKERSON, from the Committee on War Claims, to which was referred the bill of the House H. R. 11965, reported in lieu thereof a resolution (H. Res. 715) referring to the Court of Claims the papers in the case of the estate of Henry Vedrine et al., accompanied by a report (No. 6099); which said resolution and report were referred to the Private Calendar.

Mr. HAUGEN, from the Committee on War Claims, to which was referred the bill of the House H. R. 12110, reported in lieu thereof a resolution (H. Res. 716) referring to the Court of Claims the papers in the case of the estate of Aaron Turner, deceased, accompanied by a report (No. 6100); which said resolution and report were referred to the Private Calendar.

Mr. SIMS, from the Committee on War Claims, to which was referred the bill of the House H. R. 12527, reported in lieu thereof a resolution (H. Res. 717) referring to the Court of Claims the papers in the case of Dr. J. J. Crunk, accompanied by a report (No. 6101); which said resolution and report were referred to the Private Calendar.

Mr. CLAYTON, from the Committee on War Claims, to which was referred the bill of the House H. R. 12668, reported in lieu thereof a resolution (H. Res. 718) referring to the Court of Claims the papers in the case of Jonathan Poulk, deceased, accompanied by a report (No. 6102); which said resolution and report were referred to the Private Calendar.

Mr. SIMS, from the Committee on War Claims, to which was referred the bill of the House H. R. 12722, reported in lieu thereof a resolution (H. Res. 719) referring to the Court of Claims the papers in the case of William M. Goforth, accompanied by a report (No. 6103); which said resolution and report were referred to the Private Calendar.

He also, from the same committee, to which was referred the bill of the House H. R. 12817, reported in lieu thereof a resolution (H. Res. 720) referring to the Court of Claims the papers in the case of the estate of H. B. Henegar, deceased, accompanied by a report (No. 6104); which said resolution and report were referred to the Private Calendar.

Mr. FULKERSON, from the Committee on War Claims, to which was referred the bill of the House H. R. 12893, reported in lieu thereof a resolution (H. Res. 721) referring to the Court of Claims the papers in the case of A. J. Bryson, accompanied by a report (No. 6105); which said resolution and report were referred to the Private Calendar.

Mr. PATTERSON of South Carolina, from the Committee on War Claims, to which was referred the bill of the House H. R. 13290, reported in lieu thereof a resolution (H. Res. 722) referring to the Court of Claims the papers in the case of Mount Zion Church, of Williamson County, Tenn., accompanied by a report (No. 6106); which said resolution and report were referred to the Private Calendar.

Mr. MAHON, from the Committee on War Claims, to which was referred the bill of the House H. R. 17302, reported in lieu thereof a resolution (H. Res. 723) referring to the Court of Claims the papers in the case of James Inman, accompanied by a report (No. 6107); which said resolution and report were referred to the Private Calendar.

Mr. CLAYTON, from the Committee on War Claims, to which was referred the bill of the House H. R. 13353, reported in lieu thereof a resolution (H. Res. 724) referring to the Court of Claims the papers in the case of the heirs of Mary A. Summerhill, deceased, accompanied by a report (No. 6108); which said resolution and report were referred to the Private Calendar.

Mr. FULKERSON, from the Committee on War Claims, to which was referred the bill of the House H. R. 17609, reported in lieu thereof a resolution (H. Res. 725) referring to the Court of Claims the papers in the case of James T. Dodson, accompanied by a report (No. 6109); which said resolution and report were referred to the Private Calendar.

Mr. MAHON, from the Committee on War Claims, to which was referred the bill of the House H. R. 17764, reported in lieu thereof a resolution (H. Res. 726) referring to the Court of Claims the papers in the case of Lewis B. Brasher, accompanied by a report (No. 6110); which said resolution and report were referred to the Private Calendar.

Mr. PATTERSON of South Carolina, from the Committee on War Claims, to which was referred the bill of the House H. R. 18004, reported in lieu thereof a resolution (H. Res. 727) referring to the Court of Claims the papers in the case of Frederick A. Holden, accompanied by a report (No. 6111); which said resolution and report were referred to the Private Calendar.

Mr. LEE, from the Committee on War Claims, to which was referred the bill of the House H. R. 18055, reported in lieu thereof a resolution (H. Res. 728) referring to the Court of Claims the papers in the case of the estate of Solomon Landis, deceased, accompanied by a report (No. 6112); which said resolution and report were referred to the Private Calendar.

Mr. HAUGEN, from the Committee on War Claims, to which was referred the bill of the House H. R. 18101, reported in lieu thereof a resolution (H. Res. 729) referring to the Court of Claims the papers in the case of the heirs of Edward and William Holderby, accompanied by a report (No. 6113); which said resolution and report were referred to the Private Calendar.

Mr. SIMS, from the Committee on War Claims, to which was referred the bill of the House H. R. 18796, reported in lieu thereof a resolution (H. Res. 730) referring to the Court of Claims the papers in the case of the Grand Lodge Independent Order of Odd Fellows of the State of Tennessee, accompanied by a report (No. 6114); which said resolution and report were referred to the Private Calendar.

Mr. KENNEDY of Nebraska, from the Committee on War Claims, to which was referred the bill of the House H. R. 19742, reported in lieu thereof a resolution (H. Res. 731) referring to the Court of Claims the papers in the case of the estate of George E. House, deceased, accompanied by a report (No. 6115); which said resolution and report were referred to the Private Calendar.

Mr. FULKERSON, from the Committee on War Claims, to which was referred the bill of the House H. R. 19972, reported in lieu thereof a resolution (H. Res. 732) referring to the Court of Claims the papers in the case of Martha A. Davis, accompanied by a report (No. 6116); which said resolution and report were referred to the Private Calendar.

He also, from the same committee, to which was referred the bill of the House H. R. 19982, reported in lieu thereof a resolution (H. Res. 733) referring to the Court of Claims the papers in the case of Robert Michaels, accompanied by a report (No. 6117); which said resolution and report were referred to the Private Calendar.

Mr. CLAYTON, from the Committee on War Claims, to which was referred the bill of the House H. R. 21865, reported in lieu thereof a resolution (H. Res. 734) referring to the Court of Claims the papers in the case of John B. Page, accompanied by a report (No. 6118); which said resolution and report were referred to the Private Calendar.

Mr. OTJEN, from the Committee on War Claims, to which was referred the bill of the House H. R. 22600, reported in lieu thereof a resolution (H. Res. 735) referring to the Court of Claims the papers in the case of Lillie L. Penrod, sole heir of Mary E. Wycough, accompanied by a report (No. 6119); which said resolution and report were referred to the Private Calendar.

#### ADVERSE REPORTS.

Under clause 2, Rule XIII, adverse reports were delivered to the Clerk, and laid on the table, as follows:

Mr. KENNEDY of Nebraska, from the Committee on War Claims, to which was referred the bill of the House (H. R. 16485) for the relief of the estate of John T. McCord, deceased, reported the same, accompanied by an adverse report (No. 6061); which said bill and report were laid on the table.

He also, from the same committee, to which was referred the bill of the House (H. R. 18117) for the relief of Oscar Von

Hoffman, reported the same, accompanied by an adverse report (No. 6062); which said bill and report were laid on the table.

Mr. MAHON, from the Committee on War Claims, to which was referred the bill of the House (H. R. 21701) for the relief of Joseph V. Cunningham and other officers of the Philippine Volunteers, reported the same, accompanied by an adverse report (No. 6063); which said bill and report were laid on the table.

#### PUBLIC BILLS, RESOLUTIONS AND MEMORIALS INTRODUCED.

Under clause 3 of Rule XXII, bills, resolutions, and memorials of the following titles were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. WEEKS: A bill (H. R. 23815) to purchase a painting of the battle of Gettysburg—to the Committee on the Library.

By Mr. PEARRE: A bill (H. R. 23816) to prevent intimidation and corruption of voters at all primary elections and at all general elections held for the purpose of nominating or electing any person to any political office under the Constitution and laws of the United States—to the Committee on Election of President, Vice-President, and Representatives in Congress.

Also, a bill (H. R. 23817) granting pensions to certain enlisted men, soldiers and officers who served in the war of the rebellion—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 23818) to provide for fixing a uniform standard of classification and grading of wheat, flax, corn, oats, barley, rye, and other grains, and for other purposes—to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. SHERMAN: A bill (H. R. 23819) to amend an act entitled "An act to regulate commerce," approved June 29, 1906—to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. LOUDENSLAGER: A bill (H. R. 23820) for the erection of a monument to the memory of Philip Kearny—to the Committee on the Library.

By Mr. SMITH of Iowa, from the Committee on Appropriations: A bill (H. R. 23821) making appropriations for fortifications and other works of defense, for the armament thereof, for the procurement of heavy ordnance for trial and service, and for other purposes—to the Union Calendar.

By Mr. STANLEY: A bill (H. R. 23822) for dredging and removing sand bars in Ohio River near Hawesville and Uniontown, Ky., and near the mouth of Green River—to the Committee on Rivers and Harbors.

By Mr. WILLIAMS: A bill (H. R. 23823) to provide reciprocal free trade in coal between the United States and the Dominion of Canada—to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. PEARRE: A bill (H. R. 23824) to require an accounting of money expended in elections, to provide for the filing of statements of receipts and disbursements of political committees with the Secretary of the Department of Commerce and Labor, and to prohibit corporations and national banking associations from directly or indirectly paying or contributing any money, property, or thing of value to any political committee or to any candidate for nomination or election to any office under the Constitution and laws of the United States—to the Committee on Election of President, Vice-President, and Representatives in Congress.

By Mr. SOUTHWICK: A bill (H. R. 23825) to protect the rights of any owner of letters patent for an invention—to the Committee on Patents.

By Mr. BROWN: A bill (H. R. 23826) for the settlement of conflicting claims of the State of Wisconsin and its grantees and of the La Pointe band and other Chippewa Indians to lands on sections 16 in La Pointe Indian Reservation, in Ashland County, Wis.—to the Committee on Indian Affairs.

By Mr. MURPHY: A bill (H. R. 23827) providing that the hours of service of certain employees engaged in operating any railroad engaged in interstate commerce in the United States shall be limited to not more than eight hours in any twenty-four consecutive hours, and for other purposes—to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. MONDELL: A bill (H. R. 23828) to amend an act approved February 24, 1905, for the protection of persons furnishing labor, materials, plans, and supplies for the construction of public works—to the Committee on the Judiciary.

Also, a bill (H. R. 23829) to provide for the computation of salaries of employees of the Government for fractional parts of a month—to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. BABCOCK: A bill (H. R. 23830) governing the maintenance of stock yards, slaughterhouses, and packing houses in the District of Columbia—to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

By Mr. PEARRE: A joint resolution (H. J. Res. 215) proposing amendments to the Constitution of the United States,

and providing for the election of United States Senators by direct vote of the people—to the Committee on Election of President, Vice-President, and Representatives in Congress.

By Mr. SIMS, from the Committee on War Claims: A resolution (H. Res. 680) referring claim to Court of Claims (bill H. R. 874)—to the Private Calendar.

By Mr. HOLLIDAY, from the Committee on War Claims: A resolution (H. Res. 681) referring claim to Court of Claims (bill H. R. 1257)—to the Private Calendar.

Also, from the same committee: A resolution (H. Res. 682) referring claim to Court of Claims (bill H. R. 1258)—to the Private Calendar.

By Mr. HAUGEN, from the Committee on War Claims: A resolution (H. Res. 683) referring claim to Court of Claims (bill H. R. 1446)—to the Private Calendar.

By Mr. CLAYTON, from the Committee on War Claims: A resolution (H. Res. 684) referring claim to Court of Claims (bill H. R. 2167)—to the Private Calendar.

Also, from the same committee, a resolution (H. Res. 685) referring claim to Court of Claims (bill H. R. 2166)—to the Private Calendar.

By Mr. HOLLIDAY, from the Committee on War Claims: A resolution (H. Res. 686) referring claim to Court of Claims (bill H. R. 1571)—to the Private Calendar.

By Mr. CLAYTON, from the Committee on War Claims: A resolution (H. Res. 687) referring claim to Court of Claims (bill H. R. 2993)—to the Private Calendar.

By Mr. LEE, from the Committee on War Claims: A resolution (H. Res. 688) referring claim to Court of Claims (bill H. R. 3474)—to the Private Calendar.

By Mr. HAUGEN, from the Committee on War Claims: A resolution (H. Res. 689) referring claim to Court of Claims (bill H. R. 3824)—to the Private Calendar.

By Mr. OTJEN, from the Committee on War Claims: A resolution (H. Res. 690) referring claim to Court of Claims (bill H. R. 3827)—to the Private Calendar.

By Mr. HAUGEN, from the Committee on War Claims: A resolution (H. Res. 691) referring claim to Court of Claims (bill H. R. 3902)—to the Private Calendar.

By Mr. LEE, from the Committee on War Claims: A resolution (H. Res. 692) referring claim to Court of Claims (bill H. R. 3903)—to the Private Calendar.

Also, from the same committee: A resolution (H. Res. 693) referring claim to Court of Claims (bill H. R. 3919)—to the Private Calendar.

By Mr. HAUGEN, from the Committee on War Claims: A resolution (H. Res. 694) referring claim to Court of Claims (bill H. R. 3957)—to the Private Calendar.

By Mr. LEE, from the Committee on War Claims: A resolution (H. Res. 695) referring claim to Court of Claims (bill H. R. 4902)—to the Private Calendar.

By Mr. CLAYTON, from the Committee on War Claims: A resolution (H. Res. 696) referring claim to Court of Claims (bill H. R. 5078)—to the Private Calendar.

By Mr. SIMS, from the Committee on War Claims: A resolution (H. Res. 697) referring claim to Court of Claims (bill H. R. 5942)—to the Private Calendar.

Also, from the same committee: A resolution (H. Res. 698) referring claim to Court of Claims (bill H. R. 5943)—to the Private Calendar.

By Mr. OTJEN, from the Committee on War Claims: A resolution (H. Res. 699) referring claim to Court of Claims (bill H. R. 5947)—to the Private Calendar.

By Mr. SIMS, from the Committee on War Claims: A resolution (H. Res. 700) referring claim to Court of Claims (bill H. R. 5951)—to the Private Calendar.

Also, from the same committee: A resolution (H. Res. 701) referring claim to Court of Claims (bill H. R. 6456)—to the Private Calendar.

By Mr. SPIGHT, from the Committee on War Claims: A resolution (H. Res. 702) referring claim to Court of Claims (bill H. R. 7614)—to the Private Calendar.

By Mr. CLAYTON, from the Committee on War Claims: A resolution (H. Res. 703) referring claim to Court of Claims (bill H. R. 7646)—to the Private Calendar.

By Mr. KENNEDY of Nebraska, from the Committee on War Claims: A resolution (H. Res. 704) referring claim to Court of Claims (bill H. R. 7779)—to the Private Calendar.

By Mr. SIMS, from the Committee on War Claims: A resolution (H. Res. 705) referring claim to Court of Claims (bill H. R. 7817)—to the Private Calendar.

By Mr. CLAYTON, from the Committee on War Claims: A resolution (H. Res. 706) referring claim to Court of Claims (bill H. R. 9049)—to the Private Calendar.

By Mr. PATTERSON of South Carolina, from the Committee



on War Claims: A resolution (H. Res. 707) referring claim to Court of Claims (bill H. R. 9348)—to the Private Calendar.

Also, from the same committee: A resolution (H. Res. 708) referring claim to Court of Claims (bill H. R. 9349)—to the Private Calendar.

By Mr. HAUGEN, from the Committee on War Claims: A resolution (H. Res. 709) referring claim to Court of Claims (bill H. R. 11195)—to the Private Calendar.

By Mr. PATTERSON of South Carolina, from the Committee on War Claims: A resolution (H. Res. 710) referring claim to Court of Claims (bill H. R. 11697)—to the Private Calendar.

By Mr. LEE, from the Committee on War Claims: A resolution (H. Res. 711) referring claim to Court of Claims (bill H. R. 11828)—to the Private Calendar.

By Mr. FULKERSON, from the Committee on War Claims: A resolution (H. Res. 712) referring claim to Court of Claims (bill H. R. 11830)—to the Private Calendar.

Also, from the same committee: A resolution (H. Res. 713) referring claim to Court of Claims (bill H. R. 11831)—to the Private Calendar.

By Mr. LEE, from the Committee on War Claims: A resolution (H. Res. 714) referring claim to Court of Claims (bill H. R. 11857)—to the Private Calendar.

By Mr. FULKERSON, from the Committee on War Claims: A resolution (H. Res. 715) referring claim to Court of Claims (bill H. R. 11965)—to the Private Calendar.

By Mr. HAUGEN, from the Committee on War Claims: A resolution (H. Res. 716) referring claim to Court of Claims (bill H. R. 12110)—to the Private Calendar.

By Mr. SIMS, from the Committee on War Claims: A resolution (H. Res. 717) referring claim to Court of Claims (bill H. R. 12527)—to the Private Calendar.

By Mr. CLAYTON, from the Committee on War Claims: A resolution (H. Res. 718) referring claim to Court of Claims (bill H. R. 12668)—to the Private Calendar.

By Mr. SIMS, from the Committee on War Claims: A resolution (H. Res. 719) referring claim to Court of Claims (bill H. R. 12722)—to the Private Calendar.

Also, from the same committee: A resolution (H. Res. 720) referring claim to Court of Claims (bill H. R. 12817)—to the Private Calendar.

By Mr. FULKERSON, from the Committee on War Claims: A resolution (H. Res. 721) referring claim to Court of Claims (bill H. R. 12893)—to the Private Calendar.

By Mr. PATTERSON of South Carolina, from the Committee on War Claims: A resolution (H. Res. 722) referring claim to Court of Claims (bill H. R. 13290)—to the Private Calendar.

By Mr. MAHON, from the Committee on War Claims: A resolution (H. Res. 723) referring claim to Court of Claims (bill H. R. 17302)—to the Private Calendar.

By Mr. CLAYTON, from the Committee on War Claims: A resolution (H. Res. 724) referring claim to Court of Claims (bill H. R. 13353)—to the Private Calendar.

By Mr. FULKERSON, from the Committee on War Claims: A resolution (H. Res. 725) referring claim to Court of Claims (bill H. R. 17609)—to the Private Calendar.

By Mr. MAHON, from the Committee on War Claims: A resolution (H. Res. 726) referring claim to Court of Claims (bill H. R. 17764)—to the Private Calendar.

By Mr. PATTERSON of South Carolina, from the Committee on War Claims: A resolution (H. Res. 727) referring claim to Court of Claims (bill H. R. 18004)—to the Private Calendar.

By Mr. LEE, from the Committee on War Claims: A resolution (H. Res. 728) referring claim to Court of Claims (bill H. R. 18055)—to the Private Calendar.

By Mr. HAUGEN, from the Committee on War Claims: A resolution (H. Res. 729) referring claim to Court of Claims (bill H. R. 18101)—to the Private Calendar.

By Mr. SIMS, from the Committee on War Claims: A resolution (H. Res. 730) referring claim to Court of Claims (bill H. R. 18796)—to the Private Calendar.

By Mr. KENNEDY of Nebraska, from the Committee on War Claims: A resolution (H. Res. 731) referring claim to Court of Claims (bill H. R. 19742)—to the Private Calendar.

By Mr. FULKERSON, from the Committee on War Claims: A resolution (H. Res. 732) referring claim to Court of Claims (bill H. R. 19972)—to the Private Calendar.

Also, from the same committee: A resolution (H. Res. 733) referring claim to Court of Claims (bill H. R. 19982)—to the Private Calendar.

By Mr. CLAYTON, from the Committee on War Claims: A resolution (H. Res. 734) referring claim to Court of Claims (bill H. R. 21865)—to the Private Calendar.

By Mr. OTJEN, from the Committee on War Claims: A reso-

lution (H. Res. 735) referring claim to Court of Claims (bill H. R. 22600)—to the Private Calendar.

By Mr. BRADLEY: A resolution (H. Res. 736) referring to the Court of Claims bill H. R. 20575—to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. MONDELL: A resolution (H. Res. 737) to pay to Mrs. Alberta De Lario a certain sum of money—to the Committee on Accounts.

By Mr. HULL: A resolution (H. Res. 738) providing for provision in the Army bill creating grade of Lieutenant-General of the Army—to the Committee on Rules.

#### PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS INTRODUCED.

Under clause 1 of Rule XXII, private bills and resolutions of the following titles were introduced and severally referred, as follows:

By Mr. ACHESON: A bill (H. R. 23831) granting an increase of pension to Joseph R. Day—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. ALLEN of New Jersey: A bill (H. R. 23832) granting an increase of pension to John H. Aughey—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 23833) granting an increase of pension to Mary M. Howell—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. AMES: A bill (H. R. 23834) granting an increase of pension to Samuel Langmaid—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. BANNON: A bill (H. R. 23835) granting an increase of pension to John O. Evans—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. BARTHOLDT: A bill (H. R. 23836) for the relief of Thomas J. Akins, assistant treasurer of the United States at St. Louis, Mo.—to the Committee on Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 23837) granting a pension to Peter Miller—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 23838) granting an increase of pension to Frederick Spies—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 23839) to correct the military record of John Quasse—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. BARTLETT: A bill (H. R. 23840) for the relief of Mary Wellmaker—to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 23841) granting an increase of pension to Kate C. Bishop—to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. BOWIE: A bill (H. R. 23842) for the relief of Joseph H. Parsons, heir of Lewis E. Parsons of Talladega, Ala.—to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. CALDER: A bill (H. R. 23843) granting an increase of pension to Frances A. Barker—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. CANNON: A bill (H. R. 23844) granting a pension to Edwin F. Foster, alias Paul Gillon—to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 23845) granting an increase of pension to George W. Cassle—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. CASSEL: A bill (H. R. 23846) granting an increase of pension to Sarah Ann Kendig—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. CHANEY: A bill (H. R. 23847) for the relief of William Donnelly and Patrick Egan—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. CHAPMAN: A bill (H. R. 23848) granting a pension to James W. Shuffelbarger—to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 23849) granting an increase of pension to Charles A. Mathews—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. COOPER of Pennsylvania: A bill (H. R. 23850) granting an increase of pension to William Freeman—to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 23851) granting an increase of pension to Isaac F. Smith—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. COUSINS: A bill (H. R. 23852) granting an increase of pension to James G. Crozer—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. CROMER: A bill (H. R. 23853) granting an increase of pension to Frank Ellis—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. CUSHMAN: A bill (H. R. 23854) granting an increase of pension to Henry Allen—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. DAWES: A bill (H. R. 23855) granting a pension to Sarah E. Sellers—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 23856) granting an increase of pension to Charles T. Alcock—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 23857) granting an increase of pension to Isaac C. Smith—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 23858) granting an increase of pension to Hugh M. Cox—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. DAWSON: A bill (H. R. 23859) granting an increase of pension to Mark D. Lillie—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 23860) granting an increase of pension to William G. Cummings—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. DOVENER: A bill (H. R. 23861) granting a pension to William L. Snider—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. FOSTER of Vermont: A bill (H. R. 23862) granting an increase of pension to Thomas Gagan—to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. GAINES of West Virginia: A bill (H. R. 23863) granting an increase of pension to Daniel Mayer—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 23864) granting an increase of pension to James A. Miller—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. GILHAMS: A bill (H. R. 23865) granting an increase of pension to John Sanford Mott—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 23866) granting an increase of pension to Silas Long—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 23867) granting an increase of pension to Joseph Rickey—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 23868) granting an increase of pension to George Buchanan—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. GOLDFOGLE: A bill (H. R. 23869) for the relief of George E. Hoffman—to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 23870) granting an increase of pension to America J. Austin—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. HALE: A bill (H. R. 23871) granting a pension to Hazlewood A. C. Bradfute—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. HARDWICK: A bill (H. R. 23872) granting an increase of pension to Charles Blacker—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. HIGGINS: A bill (H. R. 23873) granting a pension to John E. Drohan—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. HOPKINS: A bill (H. R. 23874) granting an increase of pension to William R. Horn—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. HOUSTON: A bill (H. R. 23875) granting an increase of pension to William M. Moore—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. JOHNSON: A bill (H. R. 23876) granting an increase of pension to William E. Richardson—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 23877) granting an increase of pension to Mary A. Edwards—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. LEE: A bill (H. R. 23878) granting a pension to Lena Wing—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. LEVER: A bill (H. R. 23879) granting an increase of pension to Elizabeth Hodge—to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. LITTLEFIELD: A bill (H. R. 23880) granting an increase of pension to Winfield S. Howe—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 23881) granting an increase of pension to Henry R. Clark—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 23882) granting a pension to Mary W. Reed—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 23883) granting a pension to Mary E. Wells—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 23884) granting a pension to Mary K. Lynch—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 23885) to correct the military record of Edgar Crockett—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 23886) to remove the charge of desertion from the naval record of Samuel E. Wadsworth, alias William Smith, second—to the Committee on Naval Affairs.

By Mr. LOWDEN: A bill (H. R. 23887) granting an increase of pension to Silas C. Yingling—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 23888) granting an increase of pension to Myron H. Perrigo—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. MARTIN: A bill (H. R. 23889) authorizing the Secretary of the Interior to issue deed of conveyance to Lyman Bal-lou to certain lands in Custer County, S. Dak.—to the Committee on the Public Lands.

By Mr. MOORE of Pennsylvania: A bill (H. R. 23890) granting an increase of pension to Jacob B. Haslam—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. MURPHY: A bill (H. R. 23891) granting an increase of pension to William Sawyer—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. MOUSER: A bill (H. R. 23892) granting an increase

of pension to Zachariah T. Houseman—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 23893) to remove the charge of desertion and grant an honorable discharge to Henry Lowmaster—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. OTJEN: A bill (H. R. 23894) granting an increase of pension to Ulysses J. Wannemaker—to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. PADGETT: A bill (H. R. 23895) granting an increase of pension to Elijah W. Adkins—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 23896) for the relief of W. A. Coffman—to the Committee on War Claims.

By Mr. PATTERSON of North Carolina: A bill (H. R. 23897) for the relief of the estate of Henry Carter, sr., deceased—to the Committee on War Claims.

By Mr. PEARRE: A bill (H. R. 23898) for the relief of R. Jane Brewer—to the Committee on War Claims.

By Mr. RYAN: A bill (H. R. 23899) granting an increase of pension to James P. Hanna—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. SAMUEL: A bill (H. R. 23900) granting a pension to Rebecca B. Baker—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. SCHNEEBELI: A bill (H. R. 23901) granting an increase of pension to William E. Sigler—to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 23902) granting an increase of pension to John Ogden—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 23903) for the relief of Evan Knecht—to the Committee on War Claims.

By Mr. SHARTEL: A bill (H. R. 23904) granting an increase of pension to Joseph H. Cox—to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 23905) granting an increase of pension to E. B. Platt—to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 23906) granting an increase of pension to Elbert C. Taylor—to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 23907) granting an increase of pension to Andrew M. Douglass—to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. SMITH of Illinois: A bill (H. R. 23908) granting an increase of pension to Jacob Konigstein—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. SMITH of Pennsylvania: A bill (H. R. 23909) granting an increase of pension to David S. Cochran—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. STERLING: A bill (H. R. 23910) granting an increase of pension to James O'Neal—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 23911) granting an increase of pension to Samuel Stauffer—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 23912) granting an increase of pension to James E. Fitzgerald—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 23913) granting an increase of pension to James H. Arrowsmith—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 23914) granting an increase of pension to Russell Puntney—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. VOLSTEAD: A bill (H. R. 23915) granting a pension to William Stegal—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. WACHTER: A bill (H. R. 23916) granting an increase of pension to Emil Umlauf—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 23917) granting an increase of pension to Solomon Marsh—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 23918) granting an increase of pension to Thomas M. Dukehart—to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. WATSON: A bill (H. R. 23919) granting a pension to Edgar C. Harris—to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 23920) granting a pension to John W. Ross—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. WELBORN: A bill (H. R. 23921) granting a pension to Anna E. Lucas—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 23922) to carry out the findings of the Court of Claims in the case of John W. Brooks, son of Isaac Brooks, deceased—to the Committee on War Claims.

By Mr. WILSON: A bill (H. R. 23923) granting an increase of pension to Elizabeth B. Thomason—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. YOUNG: A bill (H. R. 23924) granting a pension to William S. Warner—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 23925) granting a pension to Mary Bemus—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

#### CHANGE OF REFERENCE.

Under clause 2 of Rule XXII, committee was discharged from the consideration of bill of the following title; which was thereupon referred as follows:

A bill (H. R. 23772) granting an increase of pension to



Temperance Davis—Committee on Invalid Pensions discharged, and referred to the Committee on Pensions.

#### PETITIONS, ETC.

Under clause 1 of Rule XXII, the following petitions and papers were laid on the Clerk's desk and referred as follows:

By the SPEAKER: Petition of Spokane (Wash.) Chamber of Commerce, for increase of salaries of Representatives and Senators in Congress—to the Committee on Appropriations.

By Mr. ALLEN of New Jersey: Petition of the Forestry Club, State Federation of Women's Clubs, for establishment of an eastern forest reserve—to the Committee on Agriculture.

Also, petition of the Association of Army Nurses of the Civil War, for the Dalzell bill pensioning ex-Union prisoners of the civil war—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, petition of the Woman's Reading Club of Rutherford, N. J., against the tariff on art works—to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. ANDRUS: Paper to accompany bill for relief of William F. Judson—to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, petition of the Yonkers Federation of Labor, against employment of Chinese laborers on the Panama Canal—to the Committee on Labor.

By Mr. BARCHFELD: Petitions of citizens of Floyd County, Ind.; citizens of Shelby County, Iowa, and citizens of Mecosta, Mich., against legislation to regulate the practice of osteopathy in the District of Columbia (bill S. 5221)—to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

Also, petition of conductors, engineers, and brakemen of the Pittsburg division of the Southwestern System, against the sixteen-hour railway bill—to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

Also, petition of the Pittsburg Composition Company, against tariff on linotype machines—to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. BARTLETT: Paper to accompany bill for relief of Mary Wellmoder—to the Committee on War Claims.

By Mr. BELL of Georgia: Paper to accompany bill for relief of Jennie A. Tall—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. BOWIE: Petition of Milton A. Smith, of Anniston, Ala., against tariff on linotype machines—to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. BURTON of Ohio: Petition of Major Cramer Camp, United Spanish War Veterans, Department of Ohio, for restoration of the Army canteen—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. CAPRON: Paper to accompany bill for relief of Gifford M. Bridges—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. CASSEL: Paper to accompany bill for relief of Sarah Ann Kendig—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. COOPER of Pennsylvania: Petition of the Publishers' League, against tariff on linotype machines—to the Committee on Ways and Means.

Also, petition of the Association of Army Nurses of the Civil War, for the Dalzell bill pensioning ex-Union prisoners of the civil war—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, paper to accompany bill for relief of William Freeman—to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, petition of the Pennsylvania State Camp, Patriotic Order Sons of America, favoring restriction of immigration (S. 4403)—to the Committee on Immigration and Naturalization.

By Mr. CROMER: Paper to accompany bill for relief of Kenneth M. Burr—to the Committee on War Claims.

By Mr. DAVIS of Minnesota: Paper to accompany bill for relief of William E. Armstrong—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. DAVIS of West Virginia: Petition of the Acme Publishing Company, against tariff on linotype machines—to the Committee on Ways and Means.

Also, paper to accompany bill for relief of Sophie F. Hunter—to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. DOVENER: Paper to accompany bill for relief of John J. Robinson—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, petition of conductors, engineers, and brakemen of the Pittsburg division of the Southwest System, against the sixteen-hour railway bill—to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. DRAPER: Petition of the Association of Army Nurses of the Civil War, for the Dalzell bill pensioning ex-Union prisoners of the civil war—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. EDWARDS: Paper to accompany bill for relief of Robert Hardwick—to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, paper to accompany bill for relief of Lucretia Hone—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, petition of Ex-Prisoners of War Association, for bill S.

3195 and the Dalzell bill (H. R. 9, Fifty-ninth Congress)—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, petition of the National Camp and the Pennsylvania State Camp, Patriotic Order Sons of America, favoring restriction of immigration (S. 4403)—to the Committee on Immigration and Naturalization.

Also, petition of Elkhorn Council, No. 126, Junior Order United American Mechanics, favoring restriction of immigration (S. 4403)—to the Committee on Immigration and Naturalization.

Also, paper to accompany bill for relief of William D. Wolford—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, paper to accompany bill for relief of Aguilla B. Gilliland—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, paper to accompany bill for relief of William L. Southgate—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, paper to accompany bill for relief of John W. Hardwick—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, paper to accompany bill for relief of Thomas J. Wells—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, petition of the Daily World, Helena, Ark., against tariff on linotype machines—to the Committee on Ways and Means.

Also, paper to accompany bill for relief of James McKelvey—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. FLOYD: Paper to accompany bill for relief of John Hurst (previously referred to the Committee on Invalid Pensions)—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. FULLER: Petition of Camp Luzon, No. 1, Army of the Philippines, favoring H. R. 18276 (medals for service in Philippine war)—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, petition of the Chicago Board of Trade, favoring one-third of Government shipments for Panama from the port of New Orleans and Gulf ports—to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

Also, petition of A. H. Bliss, for bill S. 2165, to pension military telegraph operators of the Army in the civil war—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, petition of the Marseilles Plaindealer, for modification of the railway rate law so that advertising can be exchanged for transportation—to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. GOLDFOGLE: Paper to accompany bill for relief of Mrs. America J. Austin—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. GRANGER: Petition of the Rhode Island Horticultural Society, of Providence, R. I., against free distribution of seeds—to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. GRIGGS: Petition of the Times-Enterprise, against tariff on linotype machines—to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. HIGGINS: Petition of the Willimantic (Conn.) Board of Trade, favorable to an increase of the salaries of post-office clerks—to the Committee on the Post-Office and Post-Roads.

By Mr. HOWELL of New Jersey: Petition of the Franco-American Food Company, of Jersey City, N. J., urging modification of the meat-inspection bill—to the Committee on Agriculture.

Also, paper to accompany bill for relief of Edward Simmons—to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. JOHNSON: Papers to accompany bills for relief of Mary A. Edwards and William E. Richardson—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. KENNEDY of Ohio: Petition of the International Seaman's Union, against the ship-subsidy bill—to the Committee on the Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

Also, petition of the Publishers' League, against tariff on linotype machines—to the Committee on Ways and Means.

Also, petition of the Evening Review, East Liverpool, Ohio, against tariff on linotype machines—to the Committee on Ways and Means.

Also, petition of Local Union No. 17, N. B. of O. P., against employment of all Asiatic cooly labor on the Panama Canal Zone—to the Committee on Labor.

By Mr. LINDSAY: Petition of the Mission Promoting Association of San Francisco, for remittance of the duty on lumber for building purposes in San Francisco—to the Committee on Ways and Means.

Also, petition of the Association of Army Nurses of the Civil War, favoring enactment of the Dalzell bill relative to pensioning ex-Union prisoners of the civil war—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. MCKINNEY: Petitions of the Rock Island (Ill.) News, against tariff on linotype machines—to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. MADDEN: Petition of citizens of Washington, D. C., favoring legislation for reduction of the price of gas in the District of Columbia—to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

By Mr. MEYER: Paper to accompany bill for relief of Antonio Hook (previously referred to the Committee on Invalid Pensions)—to the Committee on War Claims.

By Mr. MURPHY: Paper to accompany bill for relief of David T. Johnson—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, paper to accompany bill for relief of John R. McMaster—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, paper to accompany bill for relief of Valentine Fraker—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, paper to accompany bill for relief of John C. Bennett—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. PATTERSON of Tennessee: Petition of the Association of Army Nurses of the Civil War, for the Dalzell bill giving pensions to ex-Union prisoners of the civil war—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. PAYNE: Paper to accompany bill for relief of William H. Hawley—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. PEARRE: Paper to accompany bill for relief of Samuel C. Young—to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, petition of the Farmers' Club of Montgomery County, favoring restriction of immigration (S. 4403)—to the Committee on Immigration and Naturalization.

By Mr. PERKINS: Petitions of the E. R. Andrews Printing Company, the Rochester Telegraph, the Rochester Herald, and the Burnett Printing Company, against tariff on linotype machines—to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. REYBURN: Petition of the Association of Army Nurses of the Civil War, for the Dalzell bill pensioning ex-Union prisoners of the civil war—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. RIXEY: Petition of Robert Andrews Division, No. 317, Brotherhood of Locomotive Engineers, for enactment of the ship-subsidy bill—to the Committee on the Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

By Mr. SCHNEEBELI: Petition of the American Academy of Medicine, favoring legislation in the interest of second-class mail matter—to the Committee on the Post-Office and Post-Roads.

Also, petition of the Times, against tariff on linotype machines—to the Committee on Ways and Means.

Also, petition of Easton Council, No. 984, Junior Order United American Mechanics, favoring restriction of immigration (S. 4403)—to the Committee on Immigration and Naturalization.

Also, petition of the San Francisco Labor Council, against the utterances of the President on the Japanese relation to the public schools of said city and favoring exclusion of Japanese coolies on the same terms as the Chinese coolies—to the Committee on Labor.

By Mr. SCOTT: Petition of the National Bankers of Kansas, against legislation proposing to guarantee deposits of national banks—to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

By Mr. SHEPPARD: Petitions of citizens of Avery, Hooks, Arthur City, and Bagwell, Tex., and of Durant and Sulphur, Ind. T., for an appropriation for improvement of the upper Red River—to the Committee on Rivers and Harbors.

By Mr. SMITH of Texas: Petition of the Evening News, El Paso, Tex., against tariff on linotype machines—to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. STAFFORD: Petition of the Spanish War Veterans, of Waukesha County, Wis., for restoration of the Army canteen—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. STERLING: Paper to accompany bill for relief of Thomas Banks—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, petition of citizens of Odell, Ill., for deep waterway from the Lakes to the Gulf—to the Committee on Rivers and Harbors.

Also, paper to accompany bill for relief of Sylvanus G. Pepple—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. THOMAS of Ohio: Paper to accompany bill for relief of Ira P. Morrison—to the Committee on War Claims.

By Mr. VAN WINKLE: Petition of the Franco-American Food Company, of Jersey City, N. J., for modification of the meat-inspection bill—to the Committee on Agriculture.

Also, petition of the Board of Trade of Bayonne, N. J., for improvement of the waterway between Staten Island and New Jersey—to the Committee on Rivers and Harbors.

By Mr. VREELAND: Petition of the Post, Jamestown, N. Y., against tariff on linotype machines—to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. WACHTER: Petition of John A. Logan Council, No. 19, Daughters of Liberty, favoring restriction of immigration (S. 4403)—to the Committee on Immigration and Naturalization.

By Mr. WELBORN: Petition of the Ruralist, Sedalia, Mo., against tariff on linotype machines—to the Committee on Ways and Means.

## SENATE.

THURSDAY, January 10, 1907.

Prayer by the Chaplain, Rev. EDWARD E. HALE.

The Secretary proceeded to read the Journal of yesterday's proceedings, when, on request of Mr. CULLOM, and by unanimous consent, the further reading was dispensed with.

The VICE-PRESIDENT. The Journal stands approved.

## ASSAY OFFICE AT SEATTLE, WASH.

The VICE-PRESIDENT laid before the Senate a communication from the Secretary of the Treasury, transmitting a letter from the Director of the Mint submitting an amended estimate of appropriation for wages of workmen, assay office at Seattle, \$30,020; which, with the accompanying paper, was referred to the Committee on Appropriations, and ordered to be printed.

## FINDINGS BY THE COURT OF CLAIMS.

The VICE-PRESIDENT laid before the Senate a communication from the assistant clerk of the Court of Claims, transmitting a certified copy of the findings of fact filed by the court in the cause of the vestry of Trinity Protestant Episcopal Church on Edisto Island, South Carolina, *v.* The United States; which, with the accompanying paper, was referred to the Committee on Claims, and ordered to be printed.

He also laid before the Senate a communication from the assistant clerk of the Court of Claims, transmitting a certified copy of the findings of fact filed by the court in the cause of Edward Buford, administrator of the estate of William R. Elliston and Maggie E. Fall and Sallie Richardson, only heirs of William H. Evans, deceased, *v.* The United States; which, with the accompanying paper, was referred to the Committee on Claims, and ordered to be printed.

## PETITIONS AND MEMORIALS.

The VICE-PRESIDENT presented a petition of the Chamber of Commerce of Colorado Springs, Colo., praying for the enactment of legislation to provide for a reclassification and increase of salaries of postal clerks in all first and second class post-offices; which was referred to the Committee on Post-Offices and Post-Roads.

Mr. FRYE presented the petition of Henry G. Crockett, of Maine, praying for the enactment of legislation for the relief of Joseph V. Cunningham and other officers of the Philippine volunteers; which was referred to the Committee on Claims.

Mr. GALLINGER presented a petition of sundry citizens of southwest Washington, praying for the enactment of legislation prohibiting steam locomotives from emitting smoke anywhere within the confines of the District of Columbia; which was referred to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

Mr. KNOX presented a petition of the New Era Club of Western Pennsylvania, Pittsburg, Pa., praying for the enactment of legislation providing for the removal of the duty on works of art; which was referred to the Committee on Finance.

He also presented a memorial of the Copper River Railway Company, of Alaska, remonstrating against the enactment of legislation providing for the construction of a railroad, telegraph, and telephone line in the district of Alaska; which was referred to the Committee on Territories.

He also presented a petition of the Merchants' Association of New York, praying for the enactment of legislation providing for increased facilities in the United States Patent Office; which was referred to the Committee on Patents.

He also presented a petition of the Association of Army Nurses of the Civil War, Brookville, Pa., praying for the enactment of legislation providing that volunteer nurses of the civil war be placed on an equality with those pensioned under the act of 1892; which was ordered to lie on the table.

He also presented petitions of C. R. Walker, secretary Altoona Lodge, Brotherhood Locomotive Firemen and Enginemen, of Altoona; Thomas F. Durkin, secretary Lodge 544, Brotherhood Railway Trainmen, of Wilkes-Barre; Nicholas Burns, secretary Lodge 250, Brotherhood Locomotive Firemen, of Wilkes-Barre; J. H. Rockenstein, secretary Brotherhood Locomotive Firemen and Engineers, of Freedom, all of the State of Pennsylvania, praying for the passage of the so-called "sixteen-hour bill;" which were ordered to lie on the table.

He also presented memorials of Local Division No. 156, Order of Railway Conductors, Binghamton; Local Division No. 172, Engineers of Delaware and Hudson System, Oneonta; Local Division No. 58, Brotherhood of Locomotive Engineers, Oneonta, all in the State of New York, and of Local Division No. 263, Brotherhood of Locomotive Engineers, Wilkes-Barre, Pa., remonstrating against the passage of the so-called "sixteen-hour bill;" which were ordered to lie on the table.

He also presented memorials of sundry citizens of Williams-